BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF THE:)

REGULAR MONTHLY BUSINESS)

MEETING)

DATE AND TIME: WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1996

9:30 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD ROOM

8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE SACRAMENTO,

CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, RPR, CSR

CERTIFICATE NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 36011

APPEARANCES

MR. DANIEL G. PENNINGTON, CHAIRMAN MR. ROBERT C. FRAZEE, VICE CHAIRMAN MR. WESLEY CHESBRO, MEMBER MS. JANET GOTCH, MEMBER MR. PAUL RELIS, MEMBER

STAFF PRESENT

MR. RALPH CHANDLER, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
MS. KATHRYN TOBIAS, LEGAL COUNSEL
MS. MARLENE KELLY, BOARD SECRETARY

INDEX

	PAGE_NO			
CALL TO ORDER	8			
EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS	8, 110 ITEM 1:			
REPORTS OF THE BOARD'S COMMITTEES: LEGISLATION & PUBLIC EDUCATION LOCAL ASSISTANCE & PLANNING PERMITTING & ENFORCEMENT MARKET DEVELOPMENT POLICY, RESEARCH & TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION	11 13 14 16 18			
ITEM 2: REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIREC	_ `			

SOUL EROW THE EXECULTAE DIRECTOR

ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA: 25

ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION OF CONTRACT CONCEPT AND AWARD FOR \$400,000 WITH THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION FOR USED OIL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

ITEM 5: CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO BOUTIN, DENTINO & DI GUISTO FOR LEGAL SERVICES TO SUPPORT THE RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE LOAN PROGRAM

ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE 1996 WRAP-OF-THE-YEAR WINNERS

ITEM 7: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SITING ELEMENT AND SUMMARY PLAN FOR KERN COUNTY

ITEM 8: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF BALDWIN PARK, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

ITEM 9: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF CARSON, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

ITEM 10: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF POMONA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

ITEM 11: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SOUTH EL MONTE, LOS ANGELES COUNTY

ITEM 12: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE
MULTIJURISDICTIONAL HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT
FOR UNINCORPORATED MODOC COUNTY AND THE CITY OF ALTURAS

ITEM 13: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE, PLACER COUNTY

ITEM 14: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF LOMA LINDA, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY

ITEM 15: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION
AND RECYCLING ELEMENT FOR THE UNINCORPORATED SAN DIEGO
COUNTY

ITEM 16: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SONORA AND THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF TUOLUMNE COUNTY AND THE COUNTYWIDE SITING ELEMENT AND SUMMARY PLAN FOR TUOLUMNE COUNTY

ITEM 17: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION
AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE
ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF DAVIS, YOLO COUNTY

ITEM 18: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION
AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE
ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO, YOLO COUNTY

- ITEM 19: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
 RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION
 AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE
 ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF WINTERS, YOLO COUNTY
- ITEM 20: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
 RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION
 AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE
 ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF WOODLAND, YOLO COUNTY
- ITEM 21: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF
 RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SOURCE REDUCTION
 AND RECYCLING ELEMENT AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE
 ELEMENT FOR THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF YOLO COUNTY
- ITEM 22: CONSIDERATION OF PETITION FOR DISPOSAL REDUCTION FOR SLUDGE DIVERSION CREDIT FOR THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
- ITEM 26: CONSIDERATION OF THE REDESIGNATION OF THE CONTRA COSTA RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE TO INCLUDE THE CITY OF CONCORD
- ITEM 27: CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE PROGRAM LOAN APPLICATION FOR PHILIP LIONUDAKIS, DBA LIONUDAKIS WOOD AND GREEN WASTE RECYCLING
- ITEM 32: CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE IN THE ISSUANCE OF A NEW SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE KERN VALLEY RECYCLING/TRANSFER STATION, KERN COUNTY
- ITEM 33: CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE IN THE ISSUANCE OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE BIG BEAR SANITARY LANDFILL, SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
- ITEM 34: CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE IN THE ISSUANCE OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR GOLD COAST RECYCLING, INC., VENTURA COUNTY
- ITEM 35: CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENCE IN THE ISSUANCE OF A REVISED SOLID WASTE FACILITY PERMIT FOR THE BILLY WRIGHT DISPOSAL SITE, MERCED COUNTY

CDECTAI	PRESENTATIONS:	
SELCIAL	FULCENTALIONS.	

ITEM 23: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT

25

ITEM 24: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND THE PROPOSED NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT REGULATIONS

ITEM 25: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURES FOR PREPARING AND REVISING CITY, REGIONAL AGENCY, AND COUNTY SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT; HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT; AND NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT REGULATIONS

STAFF PRESENTATION 42
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
BOARD DISCUSSION
ACTION 48, 49, 50, 51

ITEM 28: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RECYCLED CONTENT TRASH BAG REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE PETITION FOR VARIANCE FOR ADHESIVE, HEAT AFFIXED STRAP BAGS

STAFF PRESENTATION	51
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	69
BOARD DISCUSSION	78
ACTION	84

ITEM 29: CONSIDERATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY DETERMINATION REGARDING PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FOR PLASTIC TRASH BAG ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS AND CONSIDERATION OF POSTPONEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY DETERMINATION REGARDING PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FOR PLASTIC TRASH BAG VARIANCE DOCUMENTATION

STAFF PRESENTATION 84

PUBLIC TESTIMONY 96, 103 BOARD

DISCUSSION 89, 98, 106 ACTION

110

ITEM 30: PULLED

ITEM 31: CONSIDERATION OF TIRE PROGRAM FUNDING ALLOCATION

STAFF PRESENTATION	111				
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	148				
BOARD DISCUSSION	117, 185 ACTION				
	191, 195, 197				
ITEM 36: CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTI	ON OF THE NEGATIVE				
DECLARATION AND FINANCIAL ASSURAN	ICES ENFORCEMENT				
REGULATIONS FOR SOLID WASTE LANDE	FILLS FINANCIAL				
ASSURANCE VIOLATIONS					
STAFF PRESENTATION	198				
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	202				
BOARD DISCUSSION	205				
ACTION	211				
ITEM 37: CONSIDERATION OF SITES	FOR REMEDIATION UNDER				
THE WASTE TIRE STABILIZATION AND	ABATEMENT PROGRAM				
	212				
STAFF PRESENTATION	212				
PUBLIC TESTIMONY					
BOARD DISCUSSION					
ACTION	214				
ADJOURNMENT	214				

1	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA					
2	WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1996					
3	9:30 A.M.					
4						
5	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: GOOD MORNING.					
6	WELCOME TO THE NOVEMBER MEETING OF THE CALIFORNIA					
7	INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD. SECRETARY					
8	PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.					
9	BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.					
10	MEMBER CHESBRO: HERE.					
11	BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.					
12	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: HERE.					
13	BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH.					
14	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: HERE.					
15	BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.					
16	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: HERE.					
17	BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.					
18	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: HERE. GOT A QUORUM					
19	PRESENT.					
20	DO ANY BOARD MEMBERS HAVE ANY EX					
21	PARTE COMMUNICATIONS TO REPORT? START WITH MR.					
22	RELIS.					
23	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: JUST I HAD A BRIEF					
24 25	DISCUSSION WITH NAN DRAKE, REPRESENTING GOLD COAST RECYCLING, CONCERNING THEIR ITEM THAT'S ON					

1 CONSENT. 2 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: MR. CHAIRMAN, I MET 3 THIS MORNING WITH JOLENE PANDZA FROM AMERICAN TIRE DISPOSAL ON THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF TIRE DISPOSAL. 4 5 MEMBER PENNINGTON: I TOO MET WITH MS. 6 PANDZA ON TIRE DISPOSAL. 7 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AND I HAVE A WRITTEN 8 CORRESPONDENCE FROM HONORABLE CRUZ BUSTAMANTE 9 DATED NOVEMBER 12TH REGARDING HIS REELECTION TO THE ASSEMBLY. A LETTER FROM CCMEC, THE CALIFORNIA 10 CEMENT MANUFACTURERS ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION, 11 LETTER DATED NOVEMBER 6TH FROM JOHN BENNETT 12 13 REGARDING THE DOMESTIC MARKETS FOR USED TIRES REPORT. AND FINALLY, A LETTER FROM MICHAEL 14 15 HARRINGTON DATED NOVEMBER 13TH, ENVIRONMENTAL 16 MOLDING CONCEPTS, REGARDING PLAYGROUND MAT 17 INSTALLATION IN THE TIRE PROGRAM FUNDING 18 ALLOCATIONS. 19 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MR. CHESBRO. 20 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I HAVE FOUR LETTERS THAT I'M GOING TO SUBMIT THE LIST TO THE 21 22 CLERK FOR THE RECORD: ONE FROM LARRY BURCH OF 23 POTRERO HILLS LANDFILL REGARDING THEIR PERMIT; M. 24 MARIN FROM THE NRDC REGARDING AB 1220 REGS; GARY 25 LISS OF CRRA, VARIETY OF TOPICS; MICHAEL

1 HARRINGTON, EMC, REGARDING THE TIRE ITEM, 2 PLAYGROUND MATS PROPOSAL FOR THE TIRES. 3 I ALSO SPOKE WITH LUPE VILLA OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES LAST WEEK REGARDING L.A. 4 CITY'S RECYCLING RATE, WHICH I MIGHT MENTION AT 5 6 THIS POINT THEY'RE SUBMITTING NUMBERS TO US AND 7 ARE ABOUT TO PUBLICIZE WHAT THEY BELIEVE IS A 8 40-PERCENT RATE FOR OUR STAFF TO ANALYZE. 9 PRELIMINARILY OUR STAFF HAS INDICATED THAT THE NUMBERS LOOK FAIRLY GOOD. IT'S OBVIOUSLY NOT AT 10 THIS POINT BEEN ANALYZED CAREFULLY BY THE BOARD 11 STAFF, BUT THAT'S EXTREMELY POSITIVE INFORMATION. 12 13 ALSO, YESTERDAY I SPOKE WITH JACK MICHAEL OF THE L.A. COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS 14 REGARDING THE -- EXCUSE ME -- COUNTY OF LOS 15 16 ANGELES REGARDING THE TIRE ITEM THAT'S BEFORE US 17 TODAY. I ALSO HAD TWO GENERAL DISCUSSIONS, WHICH 18 I'M GOING TO HAVE TO GET THE MEETING LIST FROM TO EX PARTE-IZE IF THAT IS A VERB. 19 20 YESTERDAY I ATTENDED CSAC COUNTY SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION, ENERGY AND NATURAL 21 RESOURCES COMMITTEE, AND HAD A WIDE RANGING 22 23 DISCUSSION WITH THEM ABOUT A VARIETY OF TOPICS, 24 BUT THE ONE THAT'S ON THE AGENDA TODAY IS TIRE

ALLOCATIONS, AND A NUMBER OF THEM HAD INPUT AS FAR

1 AS TIRE ALLOCATIONS. 2 I ALSO WENT TO AN OIL WORKSHOP IN --3 USED OIL RECYCLING WORKSHOP IN ORANGE COUNTY YESTERDAY AND, AGAIN, HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH A 4 5 NUMBER OF LOCAL OFFICIALS ABOUT OUR OIL RECYCLING 6 PROGRAM. SO I'LL BE SUBMITTING THOSE LISTS AS 7 PART OF A WRITTEN EX PARTE, BUT I WANTED TO 8 DISCLOSE THOSE CONVERSATIONS. 9 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU. AS A REMINDER TO ANYONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO WISHES TO 10 11 SPEAK, THERE ARE SPEAKER SLIPS IN THE BACK OF THE 12 ROOM ON THE TABLE. IF YOU FILL ONE OUT AND BRING IT TO MS. KELLY, WE WILL BE HAPPY TO HEAR FROM 13 14 YOU. LET'S SEE. I HAVE A FEW 15 ANNOUNCEMENTS ABOUT THE BOARD'S AGENDA. ITEM 30 16 17 HAS BEEN PULLED FROM TODAY'S AGENDA. THE BOARD 18 WILL HEAR ITEM 38 AFTER ACTION ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR TO ACKNOWLEDGE INDIVIDUALS AND 19 20 ORGANIZATIONS FOR THEIR COMMITMENT TO WASTE 21 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING PROGRAMS. 22 NOW WE'LL GO INTO COMMITTEE REPORTS, 23 FIRST BEING LEGISLATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION, MRS. 24 GOTCH, THE CHAIR.

BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU, MR.

1 CHAIRMAN. THE LEGISLATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMITTEE MET ON NOVEMBER 14TH TO HEAR A REPORT ON 2 3 THE WASTE PREVENTION EDUCATION PARTNERSHIP PROJECT 4 THE BOARD HAS WITH THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES 5 AND CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES. 6 THIS PROJECT ENABLED THE BOARD TO PROVIDE 7 ONE-ON-ONE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL 8 JURISDICTIONS TO HELP PROMOTE WASTE PREVENTION STRATEGIES. THIS EFFORT INCLUDED 292 CITIES AND 9 10 58 COUNTIES WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE WASTE 11 PREVENTION EDUCATION ACTIVITIES. 12 THE COMMITTEE HEARD A REPORT FROM REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE LEAGUE AND CSAC. 13 14 PRESENTATION INCLUDED AN OVERVIEW OF REPORTS AND 15 ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND RESULTS ACHIEVED. BOTH 16 REPORTS PROVIDED INVALUABLE INFORMATION ON THE 17 VARIOUS REGIONAL WASTE PREVENTION PROJECTS 18 CONDUCTED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 19 FOR FUTURE EFFORTS. THESE PROJECTS HELP TO CREATE 2.0 AN INCREASED PUBLIC AWARENESS OF WASTE REDUCTION

AND WASTE PREVENTION STRATEGIES. STAFF WAS

DIRECTED TO FURTHER EXPLORE THE REPORT'S

2.1

23 RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT BACK TO THE

COMMITTEE

24 AT A LATER DATE.

ONCE AGAIN, I'D LIKE TO COMMEND

OUR

- 1 PUBLIC EDUCATION STAFF AND IN PARTICULAR BECKY WILLIAMS FOR ALL THEIR HARD WORK IN MAKING THIS 2 3 PROJECT A HUGE SUCCESS. THAT CONCLUDES MY REPORT. 4 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU, 5 MRS. GOTCH. NOW LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING 6 COMMITTEE, WESLEY CHESBRO CHAIR. 7 BOARD BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: YES, MR. 8 CHAIRMAN, THE LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE RECEIVED UPDATES FROM THE TWO DIVISIONS 9 10 THAT ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR AREAS THAT THE COMMITTEE 11 OVERSEES. THE COMMITTEE CONSIDERED 27 PLANNING 12 DOCUMENTS, WHICH REPRESENTED APPROXIMATELY 18 JURISDICTIONS. ALL OF THE PLANS ARE ON THE 13 14 CONSENT CALENDAR TODAY, YOU'LL BE HAPPY TO NOTE. 15 COMMITTEE ALSO APPROVED A PETITION FOR SLUDGE 16 DIVERSION CREDIT FOR THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, AND 17 THIS WAS ALSO PLACED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA. 18 IN OTHER NEWS, THE MATCH OF THE 19 CATALOG FOR THE SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER ISSUE OF THE 20 CALMAX CATALOG FEATURES A GENTLEMAN WHO USED THE
- 22 ENSENADA, MEXICO. MR. LOU HERNANDEZ FOUND MOST OF

CATALOG TO OBTAIN MATERIALS TO BUILD HIS

THE MATERIALS NEEDED FOR THE HOUSE HE'S

2.1

HOUSE IN

BUILDING

- FROM NUMEROUS CALMAX EXCHANGES. IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT HE NOW HAS OPENED A
- BUSINESS

- 1 THAT INVOLVES FINDING MATERIALS THROUGH THE
- 2 EXCHANGE AND PROVIDING THEM TO PEOPLE DOING
- 3 SIMILAR PROJECTS IN MEXICO AND THEN ACTIVELY
- 4 UTILIZING THE CALMEX ASPECT OF CALMAX.
- 5 MR. HERNANDEZ FIRST HEARD ABOUT
- 6 CALMAX SEVERAL YEARS AGO WHILE ATTENDING THE ECO
- 7 EXPO CONFERENCE. WITH THE HELP OF CALMAX HE ALSO
- 8 STARTED -- I MENTIONED THE BUSINESS. MR.
- 9 HERNANDEZ' EXCHANGE HAS FIT IN WELL WITH CALMAX'
- 10 NEW PROMOTION, WHICH IS CALMEX, AND THROUGH HIS
- 11 TRANSACTIONS HE'S SAVED OVER \$7,600 AND DIVERTED
- 12 14,000 POUNDS OF MATERIALS FROM THE LANDFILL. I
- 13 THINK THIS IS A GREAT EXAMPLE OF HOW CALMAX HAS
- 14 EVOLVED OVER THE YEARS AND IS BEING USED. THIS
- 15 CONCLUDES MY REPORT.
- 16 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU, MR.
- 17 CHESBRO. NEXT IS THE PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT
- 18 COMMITTEE, MR. FRAZEE, CHAIR.
- BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN.
- 20 PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT MET ON NOVEMBER 6TH.
- 21 FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE
- 22 AND ARE RECOMMENDED FOR TODAY'S CONSENT AGENDA.
- 23 FIRST OF ALL, A NEW PERMIT FOR THE KERN VALLEY
- 24 RECYCLING AND TRANSFER STATION IN KERN COUNTY AND
- 25 REVISED PERMITS FOR THE BIG BEAR LANDFILL IN SAN

1 BERNARDINO COUNTY, GOLD COAST RECYCLING AND TRANSFER STATION, VENTURA COUNTY, AND THE BILLY 2 3 WRIGHT LANDFILL IN MERCED COUNTY. 4 ON TODAY'S REGULAR AGENDA IS ITEM 36 5 REGARDING ADOPTION OF FINANCIAL ASSURANCES 6 ENFORCEMENT REGULATIONS AND ITEM 37 REGARDING 7 SITES FOR REMEDIATION UNDER THE WASTE TIRE 8 STABILIZATION AND ABATEMENT PROGRAM. 9 COMMITTEE ALSO CONSIDERED THE 10 AB 1220 REGULATION PACKAGE AND APPROVED STAFF'S 11 RECOMMENDATION TO NOTICE REVISIONS TO THE 12 REGULATIONS FOR AN ADDITIONAL 15-DAY COMMENT 13 PERIOD. 14 AND FINALLY, THE COMMITTEE HAD AN 15 EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION ON ISSUES RELATING TO 16 REGULATIONS REGARDING NONHAZARDOUS ASH OPERATIONS 17 AND FACILITIES. THE ISSUE WAS BROUGHT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE UNDER THE CATEGORY OF THE BOARD'S 18 19 AUTHORITY TO REGULATE IN THIS PARTICULAR 20 COMMODITY. THE STAFF HAS BEEN INSTRUCTED TO 2.1 REPORT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE AT THE DECEMBER 11TH 22 MEETING. AND THAT CONCLUDES MY REPORT. 23 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU, MR. 2.4 FRAZEE. NEXT IS MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

25

CHAIRED BY MR. RELIS.

BOARD MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, WE HAD 1 SIX ITEMS, AND FOUR OF WHICH ARE ON TODAY'S 2 3 AGENDA. TWO ARE INFORMATION MATTERS, AND I WILL 4 BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHAT THEY WERE. WE HEARD A 5 PRESENTATION BY J. P. ELLMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE LOS б ANGELES BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS, AND KELLY INGALLS 7 OF THE PUBLIC WORKS STAFF, REGARDING RECYCLED 8 CONTENT IN THE POTENTIAL BUILDOUT OF PLAYA VISTA, WHICH WOULD BE THE OLD HOWARD HUGHES SITE, THE 9 10 LARGEST -- COULD BE THE LARGEST DEVELOPMENT IN THE 11 STATE OF CALIFORNIA. 12 WE HAVE BEEN EXPLORING FOR SOME TIME WITH MS. ELLMAN AND MR. INGALLS A WORKING 13 14 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BOARD AND THE CITY OF LOS 15 ANGELES CONCERNING CLARIFICATION OF RECYCLED 16 CONTENT USE OPPORTUNITIES IN THE BUILDOUT OF THIS 17 ENTIRE PROJECT. STAFF IS WORKING WITH THE CITY TO 18 DEVELOP A TECHNICAL MANUAL ON DEMOLITION AND 19 CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES THAT CAN BE USED BY LOCAL 20 OFFICIALS, CONTRACTORS, DEVELOPERS, AND SO ON AROUND THE STATE. SO WHILE THE FOCUS FOR THE 21 22 MOMENT IS ON PLAYA VISTA, THE MANUAL IS BEING 23 DESIGNED FOR STATEWIDE APPLICABILITY. 2.4 THE SECOND INFORMATION ITEM

CONCERNED THE BOARD'S MARKET DEVELOPMENT

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY. AS YOU KNOW, WE HAVE

1

ADOPTED A NEW MARKET DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 1996, 2 3 CARRYING US THROUGH THE COMPLETION OF OUR 4 50-PERCENT MARKET DEVELOPMENT EFFORT. STAFF 5 DESCRIBED ITS PROGRESS IN DEVELOPING A WORK PLAN б TO DESIGNATE STAFF ASSIGNMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THAT 7 1996 PLAN, INCLUDING NECESSARY CROSS-DIVISIONAL 8 COORDINATION, AND ARE DEVELOPING A TRACKING METHODOLOGY WHICH IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR ASSESSING 9 10 OUR STATEWIDE PROGRESS TOWARDS THE 50-PERCENT 11 DIVERSION GOAL AND THE ATTENDANT MARKET 12 DEVELOPMENT. ON ACTION ITEMS, WE TOOK UP THE 13 14 REDESIGNATION OF THE CONTRA COSTA RECYCLING MARKET 15 DEVELOPMENT ZONE TO INCLUDE THE CITY OF CONCORD. 16 THAT'S ON CONSENT TODAY. WE TOOK UP THE RECYCLING 17 MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE LOAN FOR PHILIP LIONUDAKIS -- I DON'T THINK I GOT THAT RIGHT --18 19 BUT THIS IS CONCERNING A WOOD AND GREEN WASTE 20 RECYCLING OPERATION. THAT IS ALSO ON CONSENT. AND WE ALSO TOOK UP THE ADOPTION OF 21 22 PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE RECYCLING CONTENT TRASH 23 BAG REGULATIONS, ITEM 28 ON TODAY'S AGENDA. THE 2.4 COMMITTEE FORWARDED THIS TO THE BOARD WITHOUT 25 RECOMMENDATION TO ALLOW STAFF TIME TO ANALYZE

1 COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE 45-DAY COMMENT PERIOD, WHICH ENDED JUST BEFORE THE COMMITTEE 2 3 MEETING. 4 THE COMMITTEE ALSO ASKED STAFF TO 5 PROVIDE AN ESTIMATE OF WHEN THE VARIANCE HEARING б MIGHT BE HELD AND WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO IRONCLAD, 7 THE PETITIONER, WITH RESPECT TO COMPLIANCE IF THE 8 HEARING IS NOT HELD AFTER JANUARY 1, 1997. 9 CONSIDERATION OF A CONFIDENTIALITY 10 DETERMINATION REGARDING PUBLIC RECORDS REQUESTS 11 FOR PLASTIC BAG ANNUAL CERTIFICATION IS ALSO ON 12 OUR AGENDA TODAY AS ITEM 29. THE COMMITTEE VOTED THREE ZERO TO RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD PROTECT 13 14 SPECIFIC INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE ANNUAL 15 CERTIFICATIONS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD, DETAILS OF WHICH WE WILL HEAR LATER, AND TO DEFER A DECISION 16 ON THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF TEST RESULTS SUBMITTED 17 18 BY IRONCLAD UNTIL THE PLASTIC BAG REGULATIONS ARE 19 AMENDED TO SET OUT THE EVIDENCE AND CRITERIA FOR Α 20 VARIANCE DETERMINATION. THAT COMPLETES THE MARKET 21 REPORT. 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU, MR.

RELIS. MR. RELIS ALSO CHAIRS THE POLICY,

24	RESEARCH,	AND	TECHNIC	AL	ASSIS	TANC	E COMM	ITTE	EE.
25	I	BOARD	MEMBER	RE	LIS:	MR.	CHAIR,	WE	HEARI

1 FOUR ITEMS, TWO OF WHICH ARE ON TODAY'S AGENDA. 2 I'D LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT THREE OF THOSE. ONE IS THE 3 CONSIDERATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS TO 4 ADDRESS WASTE TIRE MANAGEMENT ISSUES. THE 5 COMMITTEE DIRECTED STAFF TO DEVELOP A LEGISLATIVE б PROPOSAL FOR DISCUSSION AND TO BRING IT TO THE 7 LEG. COMMITTEE WHEN APPROPRIATE. THIS IS 8 CONCERNING TIRE WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES IN THE FORM OF LEGISLATION. 9 10 CONSIDERATION WAS GIVEN OF POLICY 11 OPTIONS CONCERNING THE REIMBURSEMENT OF PROPERTY 12 OWNERS FOR TIRE PILE CLEANUP COSTS. COMMITTEE DIRECTED STAFF TO ASSESS IN MORE DETAIL WHETHER 13 14 THE BOARD HAS LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE 15 REIMBURSEMENTS TO PROPERTY OWNERS FOR CLEANUP 16 COSTS; AND, IF SUCH AUTHORITY DOES EXIST, TO 17 RETURN TO THE POLICY COMMITTEE IN JANUARY WITH A 18 DRAFT POLICY FRAMEWORK. THAT'S IF A PARTY HAS A 19 TIRE PILE, THEY HAVE CLEANED IT UP, CAN THEY BE 20 SUBJECT TO REIMBURSEMENT. 21 AND FINALLY, THE TIRE PROGRAM 22 FUNDING ALLOCATIONS. THE COMMITTEE CONDUCTED 23 FURTHER WORK ON THE 1996/97 ALLOCATIONS, AND I'M 2.4 SURE WE'LL BE HEARING MUCH MORE ABOUT THIS AS THE

MEETING UNFOLDS. THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I THINK YOU ARE 1 2 RIGHT. 3 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: CAN I COMMENT ON 4 ONE THING THAT PAUL MENTIONED? THIS PROBABLY 5 COMES UNDER THE CLASSIFICATION OF EX PARTES STILL, 6 BUT ONE OF THE THINGS I HEARD YESTERDAY AT THE 7 CSAC MEETING THAT WAS QUITE STRIKING, AND I DON'T 8 KNOW THAT IT'S SOMETHING THE BOARD CAN PROPOSE OR IS PRACTICAL AT THIS POINT, BUT THERE WAS A HIGH 9 10 LEVEL OF FRUSTRATION EXPRESSED ABOUT THE LOW LEVEL 11 OF THE TIRE FEE AND ITS INADEQUACY FOR COVERING 12 ALL OF THE MANY THINGS THAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO. AND I HEARD THAT FROM A NUMBER OF 13 14 SUPERVISORS, SO THERE'S -- WE MAY BE ACTUALLY 15 SEEING A PROPOSAL EMERGE FROM LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR A HIGHER LEVEL NOW. THAT'S NOT AN EASY THING 16 17 POLITICALLY TO HAVE HAPPEN, BUT I THOUGHT IT WAS 18 SIGNIFICANT THAT THERE'S THAT OPINION OUT THERE. AND IN RELATION -- THIS IS IN RELATION TO YOUR 19 20 COMMENT ABOUT THE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS, AND I 2.1 JUST WANTED TO GIVE THAT FEEDBACK TO THE BOARD 22 MEMBERS. 23 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU. OKAY. 2.4 NEXT IS THE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE REPORT, WHICH

I CHAIR. THE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE MET ON

1 NOVEMBER 5 AND CONSIDERED TWO ITEMS, BOTH OF WHICH ARE ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR. 2 3 FIRST, THE COMMITTEE AWARDED 400,000 4 TO THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION FOR USED OIL 5 EDUCATION ACTIVITIES. AND SECOND, THE COMMITTEE б APPROVED THE CONTRACT FOR LEGAL SERVICES TO 7 SUPPORT THE RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE LOAN 8 PROGRAM. 9 THAT CONCLUDES THE REPORTS OF THE 10 COMMITTEES. NOW WE'LL HAVE A REPORT FROM THE 11 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, MR. CHANDLER. 12 MR. CHANDLER: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. AND GOOD MORNING, MEMBERS. FOUR KIND OF 13 14 INFORMATIONAL ITEMS THIS MORNING I'D LIKE TO 15 BRIEFLY COVER WITH YOU. THE FIRST HAS TO DO WITH 16 JUST GIVING YOU AN UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE SAN 17 MARCOS LANDFILL FINANCIAL ASSURANCE ISSUE, AND 18 MORE SPECIFICALLY TO APPRISE YOU, IF YOU HAVE NOT HEARD, THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS 19 20 HAS VOTED TO DISBAND OR DISSOLVE THE JPA KNOWN AS SAN DIEGO SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY. 21 22 THIS WILL CLEARLY PUT RESPONSIBILI-23 TIES FOR FINANCIAL ASSURANCES BACK AT THE COUNTY

AND THIS, COUPLED WITH THE RECENT COURT

DECISION TO UPHOLD THE CITY OF SAN MARCOS' REQUEST

2.4

25

LEVEL.

1 TO SEE THE LANDFILL CLOSE IN MARCH OF 1997, MEANS THE COUNTY MUST COME UP WITH BUDGET REVENUE OR 2 3 OTHER MEANS TO ASSURE PROPER FINANCIAL ASSURANCES 4 FOR THE SAN MARCOS LANDFILL. 5 IT'S MY RECOLLECTION THAT WE HAVE A б LETTER TO THE COUNTY ASSERTING THIS FACT, AND THEY 7 ARE TO RESPOND BY, I BELIEVE, JANUARY 7TH OF 1997. 8 AS A RESULT, I ALSO PLAN TO MEET SOON WITH THE NEWLY APPOINTED COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, MR. 9 10 LARRY PRYOR, TO GO OVER THE COUNTY'S PLANS FOR 11 MEETING THEIR FINANCIAL ASSURANCE REQUIREMENTS. 12 AND I WILL BE KEEPING YOU ALL POSTED ON THE DEVELOPMENTS ON THAT IMPORTANT FACILITY. 13 14 WORKSHOPS ON ALTERNATIVE DAILY 15 COVER, BOARD STAFF WILL HOLD TWO WORKSHOPS IN 16 DECEMBER TO TAKE COMMENTS ON REGULATIONS RELATING 17 TO ALTERNATIVE DAILY COVER STEMMING FROM THE PASSAGE OF THIS YEAR'S AB 1647. THESE INFORMAL 18 WORKSHOPS WILL BE HELD MONDAY, DECEMBER 2D FROM 10 19 20 A.M. TO 3 P.M. IN SAN LEANDRO; AND ON THURSDAY, 21 DECEMBER 5TH, FROM 10 A.M. TO 3 P.M. IN WHITTIER. 22 THE PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOPS IS TO SOLICIT INPUT 23 PRIOR TO REG DEVELOPMENT TO ESTABLISH CONDITIONS 2.4 FOR THE USE OF ADC THAT'S CONSISTENT WITH EXISTING

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT LAW.

1 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WHY DOES THIS SOUND SO FAMILIAR? SOMEHOW WE'VE HEARD THIS TOPIC 2 3 BEFORE, LIKE THREE OR FOUR TIMES, I THINK. 4 MR. CHANDLER: AS YOU KNOW, THE AB 1647 5 DIRECTS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER SPECIFIC CRITERIA б WHEN ADOPTING THESE REGULATIONS, BUT LEAVES OPEN 7 THE CONTENT OF THE REGS. WHICH THE WORKSHOPS WILL 8 ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS. 9 MY NEXT ITEM DEALS WITH THE ORGANIC 10 RECYCLING WORKSHOPS WE RECENTLY HELD. IT REALLY 11 IS THE KICKOFF WORKSHOPS FOR OUR LEA TRAINING FOR 12 THE YEAR. THE BOARD WILL HOLD TWO WORKSHOPS, ONE ON ORGANICS MATERIAL RECYCLING ODOR CONTROL 13 14 BEGINNING TOMORROW IN SUNNYVALE AND FOLLOWING ON 15 DECEMBER 4TH IN SAN BERNARDINO. 16 CONSISTENT WITH MY DESIRE TO HAVE A 17 MORE INTEGRATED AND COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO OUR 18 TRAINING DELIVERIES, THESE WORKSHOPS WILL INVOLVE THE PARTICIPATION OF NOT ONLY LEA'S AND BOARD 19 20 STAFF, BUT ALSO INCLUDE OTHER RELATED CONSTITUENT 21 GROUPS SUCH AS COMPOST OPERATORS AND LOCAL AIR 22 QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT STAFF. 23 THIS IS JUST THE BEGINNING OF WHAT Ι

PLAN OVER TIME TO BECOME A NEW, MORE

1 OUR TECHNICAL TRAINING AT THE BOARD, AND I WILL 2 PROVIDE UPDATES TO YOU ON THIS IN THE COMING 3 MONTHS. MY LAST ITEM CONCERNS THE PROPOSED 4 MESQUITE REGIONAL LANDFILL IN IMPERIAL COUNTY. I 5 6 THOUGHT YOU SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THE REQUEST FOR A 7 STAY ON THE LAND EXCHANGE HAS BEEN HEARD BY THE 8 INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS AND HAS BEEN 9 DENIED, ALLOWING THE EXCHANGE TO GO FORWARD AND LETTING STAND THE RECORD OF DECISION. THIS WAS 10 11 COMMUNICATED THROUGH OUR LEA FROM IMPERIAL COUNTY 12 TO BOARD STAFF. 13 AND SO WHILE IT HAS NOT BEEN RECORDED, WE EXPECT IT WILL SOON. THAT WILL PUT 14 THE CUP TO REFLECT THIS EXCHANGE, AND THEY WILL 15 16 THEN BE IN A POSITION TO START MOVING FORWARD 17 THEIR PERMIT APPLICATION. AND I WOULD IMAGINE 18 WE'LL SEE AN APPLICATION SHORTLY AFTER THE FIRST OF THE YEAR. 19 20 THAT CONCLUDES MY UPDATE FOR TODAY. 21 THANK YOU. 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU, MR.

CHANDLER. ANY QUESTIONS OF MR. CHANDLER? OKAY.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS. CONSENT AGENDA INCLUDES

NEXT WE HAVE CONSIDERATION OF

23

24

- 1 ITEMS 4 THROUGH 22, 26, 27 AND 32 THROUGH 35. IS
- THERE ANY MEMBER WHO WISHES TO PULL ANY ITEM FROM
- 3 THE CONSENT CALENDAR? IF NOT, I'LL ENTERTAIN A
- 4 MOTION.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I'LL MOVE ADOPTION
- 6 OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: SECOND.
- 8 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
- 9 SECONDED. WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL,
- 10 PLEASE.
- 11 BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.
- BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.
- BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.
- BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH.
- BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.
- 17 BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.
- BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
- 19 BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.
- 20 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE.
- 21 NEXT WE HAVE OUR SPECIAL ITEMS HERE,
- 22 STARTING WITH BOARD MEMBER JANET GOTCH, CHAIR OF
- THE LEGISLATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMITTEE.
- BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU, MR.
- 25 CHAIR.

1 ON SEPTEMBER 18TH OF THIS YEAR 2 GOVERNOR WILSON SIGNED SB 1535, KILLEA, INTO LAW. 3 THIS BILL WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY BY ALL COMMITTEES AND BOTH HOUSES OF THE STATE 4 5 LEGISLATURE. SB 1535 WAS A VERY CRITICAL PIECE OF 6 LEGISLATION FOR THE BOARD THIS PAST SESSION 7 BECAUSE IT AFFECTED OUR MARKET DEVELOPMENT 8 PROGRAM. AS MOST OF YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE KEYS TO 9 REACHING 50 PERCENT BY THE YEAR 2000 IS FOR CALIFORNIA TO CREATE, DEVELOP, AND EXPAND MARKETS 10 FOR RECYCLABLES. 11 12 SB 1535 EXTENDS THE RECYCLING MARKET 13 DEVELOPMENT ZONE PROGRAMS LOAN SUNSET DATE FROM 1997 TO THE YEAR 2006 AND ENABLES THE BOARD TO 14 PARTICIPATE IN THE TREASURER'S CAPITAL ACCESS LOAN 15 16 PROGRAM. THESE PROVISIONS EFFECTIVELY INCREASE 17 THE BOARD'S ABILITY TO LEVERAGE THE RMDZ MONEY 18 AVAILABLE FOR LOANS WHILE CONCURRENTLY PROVIDING MILLIONS MORE IN FUNDING FOR LOANS TO RECYCLING 19 20 BASED BUSINESSES IN CALIFORNIA OVER THE LIFE OF 21 THE RMDZ PROGRAM. 22 OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS, THE BOARD 23 HAS DESIGNATED 40 RMDZ'S IN THE STATE. 24 RECYCLING BUSINESSES IN THESE AREAS HAVE CREATED 25 HUNDREDS OF NEW JOBS, HELPING US TO DIVERT

1 MILLIONS OF TONS OF SO-CALLED WASTE. 2 THE PASSAGE OF SB 1535 WAS DUE IN A 3 LARGE PART TO THE STRONG TRACK RECORD OF OUR STAFF IN THE RMDZ PROGRAM AND OUR LEGISLATIVE OFFICE, AS 4 5 WELL AS THE HARD WORK OF THE ZONE ADMINISTRATORS 6 THROUGHOUT THE STATE. IN THE CAPITOL THE BILL'S 7 SUCCESS CAN BE ATTRIBUTED LARGELY TO THE ENERGY OF 8 TOM HIGGINS IN SENATOR KILLEA'S OFFICE. TOM HAS A 9 LONG HISTORY OF WORKING ON ISSUES RELATED TO SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT, AND HIS INVOLVEMENT WITH THIS 10 BILL WAS IMMEASURABLE. 11 ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD, I'D LIKE TO 12 13 THANK TOM AND BRING HIM FORWARD OVER TO THE PODIUM, I GUESS WOULD BE A GOOD SPOT, AND HE'LL 14 15 MAKE SOME COMMENTS AND ADDITIONAL PRESENTATIONS. 16 TOM HIGGINS. 17 MR. HIGGINS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR 18 HAVING ME, AND I APPRECIATE THOSE KIND COMMENTS. 19 THANK YOU VERY MUCH, AND I'M SORRY THAT SENATOR 20 KILLEA COULDN'T BE HERE. AS YOU KNOW, SHE'S RETIRING, AND SHE WORKED VERY HARD ON INTEGRATED 21 22 WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES, INCLUDING THE 1989 ACT. 23 AND SHE WORKED ON MARKETS AND KNEW THAT MARKETS 24 WERE, JUST AS IN REAL ESTATE, GOT LOCATION,

LOCATION, LOCATION. EVERYBODY IN THIS ROOM KNOWS

1 IN RECYCLING YOU HAVE MARKETS, MARKETS, AND 2 MARKETS. 3 SO THE BILL WAS VERY IMPORTANT, AND I THINK THAT ANOTHER THING THAT IS SIGNIFICANT 4 ABOUT THE BILL IS NOT ONLY IN HELPING US MOVE 5 6 FORWARD IN OUR EFFORT TO BUILD AN INFRASTRUCTURE 7 FOR MARKETS SO THAT WE REALLY CAN MAKE INTEGRATED 8 WASTE MANAGEMENT HAPPEN, THE OTHER THING WAS THAT 9 WE MOVED A BILL FORWARD IN AN ATMOSPHERE LAST YEAR WHICH WAS SORT OF TRICKY TO MOVE ANY BILL FORWARD 10 11 IN. AND WE HAVE DIFFERENCES. I KNOW YOU 12 13 HAVE A FEW ON THE BOARD OCCASIONALLY, AND WE HAVE THEM IN THE LEGISLATURE. AND IT WAS SORT OF 14 EXCITING TO PULL TOGETHER AND WORK ON SOMETHING 15 16 THAT WAS A CONSTRUCTIVE AND APPROPRIATE AND 17 SOMETHING THAT WE COULD ALL WORK TOGETHER ON. 18 THE BILL WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE WITHOUT THE HELP OF THE RMDZ ASSOCIATION, AND I 19 20 WANT TO TAKE JUST A MOMENT TO SAY SPECIAL THANKS 21 AND TO INVITE JIM KUHL AND CHRISTY BEEMAN OF THE 22 RMDZ ASSOCIATION TO COME UP. THEY HAVE WORKED TO 23 HELP MAKE THE ASSOCIATION TO MAKE THE RMDZ PROGRAM 24 EFFECTIVE AND TO GET THE LOANS ROLLING AND TO 25 BRING THE BUSINESSES IN AND TO MAKE RECYCLING

1

25

HAPPEN.

2 IF YOU COULD HANG ON JUST A SECOND. 3 BROUGHT YOU A LITTLE TOKEN OF OUR APPRECIATION AT 4 THE LEGISLATURE FOR YOUR HARD WORK. JIM. 5 YOU VERY MUCH. WE'RE DOING THE REAL THINGS NOW. б THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 7 (APPLAUSE.) 8 MR. HIGGINS: THANKS A LOT. YOU'RE WELCOME TO GIVE A 45-MINUTE SPEECH IF YOU LIKE. 9 10 MS. BEEMAN: WELL, I AM GOING TO TAKE 11 THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SAY A FEW WORDS. I'M CHRISTY 12 BEEMAN. I'M THE ZONE COORDINATOR FOR THE OAKLAND-BERKELEY RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE 13 14 AND THE CURRENT PRESIDENT OF THE CALIFORNIA 15 ASSOCIATION OF RMDZ'S. AND IT'S REALLY A GREAT 16 PLEASURE TO BE HERE ON BEHALF OF OUR ASSOCIATION 17 ON -- IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL, WHICH REALLY IS KEY TO THE CONTINUED SUCCESS OF 18 19 THE RMDZ PROGRAM. AND AS AN ASSOCIATION, WE ARE 20 VERY PLEASED TO SEE THAT THE LOANS ARE GOING TO 21 CONTINUE FOR THE NEXT TEN YEARS. 22 IN THE OAKLAND-BERKELEY ZONE ALONE, 23 WE CREDIT THE LOAN PROGRAM WITH GENERATING OVER \$2 2.4 MILLION OF INVESTMENT IN RECYCLING AND REUSE

PROJECTS IN OUR AREA AND INCREASING OUR -- OR

1 ADDING A HUNDRED THOUSAND TONS PER YEAR OF MARKET 2 CAPACITY IN OAKLAND AND BERKELEY, AND THE 3 CONTINUATION OF THE LOAN PROGRAM IS GOING TO ALLOW US TO CONTINUE THAT SUCCESS. 4 5 BUT AS WE'RE HERE CELEBRATING THE 6 NEW LONGEVITY OF THE LOAN PROGRAM, OF COURSE, WE 7 WOULDN'T PASS UP AN OPPORTUNITY TO REASSESS AND 8 CONSIDER HOW WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO ENHANCE THIS 9 PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE. ON BEHALF OF THE ASSOCIATION, WE HAVE A FEW RECOMMENDATIONS OR 10 11 IDEAS THAT WE'D LIKE TO SEE YOU CONSIDER. A 12 COUPLE RELATING TO MORE THE ADMINISTRATIVE SIDE, 13 HOW THE APPLICATION AND APPROVAL PROCESS WORKS. 14 I KNOW SOME OF THESE CHANGES ARE ALREADY IN PROCESS, AND I'VE SEEN SOME DRAFT 15 16 REGULATIONS THAT WE'RE VERY PLEASED TO SEE, AND 17 WE'LL BE SUBMITTING SOME SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THE 18 REGULATIONS. A FEW IDEAS ON THE POLICY SIDE TOO THAT ARE MORE TRICKY, BUT REALLY AIMED AT 19 20 EXPANDING THE FOCUS OF THE PROGRAM BEYOND JUST THE 21 DIVERSION AND MORE INTO THE BROADER MARKET 22 DEVELOPMENT FOCUS THAT WE FEEL IS NECESSARY AS WE 23 APPROACH OUR YEAR 2000 CHALLENGE OF 50-PERCENT 24 DIVERSION.

SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH. AND I HAVE

1 SOME MORE DETAILS HERE IN A LETTER THAT I'LL LEAVE 2 HERE TODAY. THANK YOU. 3 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS COMES UNDER THE CATEGORY OF IMITATION IS THE 4 SINCEREST FORM OF FLATTERY. I RECENTLY BECAME 5 6 AWARE THROUGH THE WESTERN STATES RECYCLING 7 COALITION THAT STATE OF UTAH PASSED A MARKET 8 DEVELOPMENT ZONE LAW AND HAS DESIGNATED 18 ZONES 9 AROUND THE STATE. I GUESS, YOU KNOW, THEY -- IT WAS MADE CLEAR TO ME BY THE PERSON THAT WAS 10 11 TELLING ME ABOUT IT THAT THEY VIEWED OUR SUPPLY 12 AND OUR CONTENT PROGRAMS AS OPPORTUNITIES FOR THEM 13 TO ATTRACT INDUSTRIES THAT COULD MORE OR LESS CYCLE MATERIALS OUT OF CALIFORNIA, BUT THE GOOD 14 NEWS IS THAT THEY DON'T HAVE A LOAN PROGRAM, BUT 15 THEY DO HAVE A VARIETY OF TAX CREDITS THAT THEY 16 17 INCLUDED AS INCENTIVES FOR SITING BUSINESSES 18 AROUND UTAH. SO THE IDEA IS GETTING OUT THERE. FORTUNATELY WE HAVE THE LOAN PROGRAM AND IT'S BEEN 19 20 RENEWED, WHICH I THINK IS A VERY SIGNIFICANT 21 INCENTIVE. 22 MS. BEEMAN: IT'S A COMPETITIVE EDGE. 23 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: YEAH. BUT I 24 THOUGHT IT WAS NOTEWORTHY THAT OTHER STATES ARE

BEGINNING TO FOLLOW OUR LEAD IN THE PROGRAM.

1 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: JIM, DID YOU HAVE 2 WORDS FOR US? 3 MR. KUHL: SINCE CHRISTY TOOK UP ALL THE TIME, I JUST DO WANT TO SAY THIS IS ACTUALLY THE 4 5 FIRST BILL I'VE REALLY EVER WORKED ON THAT WENT 6 THROUGH WITHOUT ANY LETTERS OF OPPOSITION FROM 7 ANYBODY, AND THAT'S VERY RARE IN THIS BUSINESS. 8 SO I WANT TO THANK ALL THE INDUSTRY SUPPORT, ALL 9 THE CITIES AND COUNTIES, AND THE BOARD FOR THEIR SUPPORT ON THIS BILL. THANK YOU. 10 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU 11 AND CONGRATULATIONS. TOM, THANK YOU FOR COMING 12 13 AND BEING WITH US. MR. HIGGINS: ONE MORE LITTLE PART, IF I 14 15 COULD. THE -- I DO WANT TO THANK THE BOARD STAFF, 16 PATTY AND DOROTHY, BECAUSE IT WAS TRICKY TO, AS 17 THE CHAIRMAN KNOWS AND EVERY MEMBER, WE HAD TO 18 BALANCE THIS THING AND MAKE IT HAPPEN. AND IT WAS A LOT OF WORK ON EVERYBODY'S PART TO BRING THE 19 20 BILL ALONG. AND ONE PERSON IN PARTICULAR HAS 21 HELPED ME UNDERSTAND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MARKETS 22 AND THE WORK THAT NEEDED TO BE DONE TO DEVELOP 23 THEM HERE IN CALIFORNIA ALL THE WAY THROUGH. SO IF THIS WERE AN AWARD, IT MIGHT BE CALLED THE 24 "THICK AND THIN AWARD" BECAUSE HE'S BEEN THERE

1 THROUGH THICK AND THIN. I WANT TO SAY A SPECIAL 2 THANKS TO BOARD MEMBER RELIS AND GIVE HIM A COPY 3 OF THE BILL ALSO. 4 (APPLAUSE.) 5 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: WELL, FIRST, I'M 6 SURPRISED AND I APPRECIATE IT VERY MUCH, AND I 7 THINK IT IS A CREDIT TO THE WHOLE STATE, THE 8 GOVERNOR, THE LEGISLATURE, THE BOARD, AND 9 CERTAINLY TO THE RECYCLING MARKET DEVELOPMENT ZONE, AND CERTAINLY TO YOUR OFFICE, THAT THIS HAS 10 FINALLY COME TO PASS, AND THE LOAN PROGRAM IS 11 12 SECURE AND AN INTEGRAL PART OF OUR EFFORTS. 13 I'D JUST TO ASK IF WE COULD MAKE ONE FURTHER REQUEST. WHILE I APPRECIATE THIS VERY 14 15 MUCH, WE'RE CREATING A SORT OF AN AWARDS ROOM FOR 16 THE BOARD IN TERMS OF OUR NOTABLE ACHIEVEMENTS, 17 AND I THINK THIS IS CERTAINLY A MILESTONE FOR THE 18 BOARD. AND COULD WE REQUEST ONE MORE OF THESE FOR 19 THE ENTRYWAY? IS THAT POSSIBLE? 20 MR. HIGGINS: SURE. 21 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I THINK I'LL PUT YOU

22

ON THE SPOT NOW.

23		MR	. HI	GGIN	IS: TH	IANK	YOU	VER	Y MUCH	•
24		СН	AIRM	IAN F	ENNING	TON:	TH	ANK	YOU.	AND,
25	TOM,	THANK	YOU	FOR	BEING	HERI	E THI	IS M	ORNING	. AND
I										

WOULD LIKE FOR YOU TO BE SURE TO TELL THE SENATOR

1

2 THAT WE ARE GOING TO MISS HER LEADERSHIP IN THE 3 LEGISLATURE, AND THIS IS ALL ANOTHER GOOD REASON 4 WHY TERM LIMITS ARE BAD. 5 OKAY. NEXT WE HAVE, MR. CHESBRO, 6 CHAIR OF THE LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING 7 COMMITTEE, TO MAKE A PRESENTATION. 8 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT'S 9 MY PLEASURE TODAY TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND PRESENT A 10 RESOLUTION TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR 11 ALL OF ITS OUTSTANDING WORK OVER MANY YEARS IN 12 OPERATING THE CALMAX PROGRAM. WE HAVE A LOT OF CONTRACTORS WHO 13 DO 14 WORK FOR THE BOARD, BUT I THINK THE LOCAL 15 GOVERNMENT COMMISSION HAS DISTINGUISHED ITSELF AS FAIRLY UNIQUE AMONGST CONTRACTORS IN TERMS OF 16 THE 17 DEGREE OF CREATIVITY AND COMMITMENT AND DOWNRIGHT 18 LOVE I THINK THAT THEY HAVE INVESTED IN THIS 19 PROJECT DURING THE YEARS THAT THEY DID HAVE THE

20	CONTRACT.
21	SINCE CALMAX' INCEPTION IN 1992,
THE	
22	LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION HAS COORDINATED THE
23	TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM, SUCH AS
UPDATII	NG
	THE DATABASE, PUBLISHING THE CATALOG, AND PROMOTING THE CALMAX CATALOG. LGC HAS HELPED

1 TRANSFORM THE CONCEPT OF CALMAX INTO A REALITY. 2 THEY PRODUCED THE FIRST CALMAX 3 CATALOG IN JANUARY OF 1992; AND BECAUSE OF ITS EXCELLENT REPUTATION AMONG LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND 4 5 BUSINESSES, THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION WAS 6 ABLE TO PROMOTE CALMAX EFFECTIVELY THROUGHOUT THE 7 STATE AND HELP CALMAX GROW. IT WAS A PREEXISTING 8 ORGANIZATION WITH A VARIETY OF SERVICES THAT WERE 9 PROVIDED TO BUSINESS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT. AND I THINK THAT'S BEEN THE KEY TO THEIR EFFECTIVENESS 10 AS A CONTRACTOR FOR THE BOARD. 11 12 LGC HAS ENTHUSIASTICALLY PROMOTED 13 CALMAX AT TRADE SHOWS AND WORKSHOPS AND PRODUCED TWO EXCELLENT PUBLICATIONS FOR THE BOARD, 14 "MARKETING TO THE MAX" AND "CALIFORNIA'S MATERIALS 15 EXCHANGE FACILITIES." IN 1993, 7700 CATALOGS WERE 16 17 PRINTED, AND THIS PEAKED AT 13,800 IN 1996. IN 18 THE FIVE YEARS THAT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION PROMOTED THE PROGRAM, MORE THAN 314,000 19 20 TONS OF MATERIAL HAVE BEEN DIVERTED FROM LANDFILLS THROUGH CALMAX, SAVING CALIFORNIA BUSINESSES OVER 21 22 \$4 MILLION. 23 AND ALTHOUGH LGC IS NO LONGER THE 24 CONTRACTOR FOR CALMAX, WE WILL BE VERY GRATEFUL TO 25 THEM -- CONTINUE TO BE VERY GRATEFUL TO THEM FOR

1 ALL THEIR HARD WORK AND EFFORTS TO GET US WHERE WE 2 ARE TODAY WITH THE PROGRAM. WE WANT TO THANK THE 3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR THEIR EXCELLENT SERVICE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS AND FOR HELPING 4 5 TO MAKE CALMAX A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM. 6 AND I UNDERSTAND PAT STONER IS HERE 7 FROM THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION. YOU WANT TO 8 COME UP FORWARD TO THE PODIUM. I'LL BE DOWN THERE 9 IN A MOMENT. 10 I HAVE A RESOLUTION. WE'RE HANDING 11 OUT LOTS OF RESOLUTIONS TODAY, BUT THIS IS A VERY 12 SPECIAL AND HEARTFELT ONE. WHEREAS, PROPER WASTE MANAGEMENT IS 13 ESSENTIAL FOR THE STATE TO CONTINUE THE ECONOMIC 14 15 STABILITY, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, AND PUBLIC 16 SAFETY; AND 17 WHEREAS, CALIFORNIA'S INTEGRATED 18 WASTE MANAGEMENT LAWS REQUIRE AGGRESSIVE AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE THE STATE'S 19 WASTE 20 REDUCTION GOALS; AND 21 WHEREAS, THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY 22 GENERATES OVER 50 PERCENT OF THE MUNICIPAL WASTE

23

IN CALIFORNIA; AND

24		WHE	REAS	, THE	CAL	IFORNIA	MATE	ERIALS
25	EXCHANGE	PROGRAM	HAS	ASSIS	TED	BUSINES	SSES	IN

1 REUSING AND RECYCLING 300,000 TONS OF MATERIAL, 2 THEREBY SAVING THEM MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN 3 DISPOSAL AND PROCUREMENT COST; AND 4 WHEREAS, THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT 5 COMMISSION HAS PROVIDED HIGH QUALITY, COST-6 EFFECTIVE, AND VISIONARY CONTRACT SERVICES TO THE 7 CALMAX PROGRAM SINCE ITS INCEPTION IN 1991; 8 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT 9 THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD DOES HEREBY COMMEND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT 10 COMMISSION FOR ITS OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE 11 CALMAX PROGRAM, THEREBY HELPING CALIFORNIA 12 13 BUSINESSES SAVE MONEY WHILE CONSERVING ENERGY, RESOURCES, AND LANDFILL SPACE. 14 I'D BE HAPPY TO PRESENT THIS TO PAT 15 ON BEHALF OF THE LGC. WE HAVE COPIES OF THE 16 17 FIRST AND THE MOST RECENT CATALOG INCLUDED IN THE 18 FRAMED COPY HERE. 19 (APPLAUSE.) 20 MR. STONER: GOOD MORNING. I'M HERE 21 ACTUALLY REPRESENTING THE TWELVE EMPLOYEES AT 22 LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION WHO HAVE WORKED ON 23 CALMAX FOR THE LAST FIVE YEARS. TWO OF THEM ARE 24 HERE TOADY TOO, LEIF CHRISTIANSON AND TONY 25 LEONARD, AND THE THREE OF US COMPRISE THE LAST

1 CALMAX CREW AT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION. 2 WE APPRECIATE THIS RECOGNITION OF 3 OUR EFFORT TO IMPLEMENT ONE OF THE BOARD'S MOST POPULAR PROGRAMS. I THINK EVERYBODY LIKES CALMAX 4 5 AND FOR GOOD REASON. WE ENJOYED WORKING ON THE 6 PROGRAM, AND WE ENJOYED WORKING WITH BOARD STAFF, 7 JOYCE MASON, KEVIN TAYLOR, AND KEN DECIO, AND WANT 8 TO WISH YOU CONTINUED SUCCESS FOR THE PROGRAM. SO 9 THANK YOU. 10 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU VERY 11 MUCH. THANK YOU. 12 NEXT WE HAVE PAUL RELIS, CHAIR OF 13 THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, TO MAKE A 14 PRESENTATION. BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I WOULD TO ASK DR. 15 16 GERALD BONETTO, WHO'S HERE FROM THE PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF CALIFORNIA, IF YOU COULD COME 17 18 FORWARD; FROM THE CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS 19 ASSOCIATION, ROY HERBURGER, JACK BATES, AND TOM 20 NEWTON; AND FROM THE AMERICAN FOREST AND PAPER 21 ASSOCIATION, JAMES TISDALE. IF YOU COULD ALL COME 22 FORWARD, PLEASE. 23 WELL, IT GIVES ME GREAT PLEASURE

TO

24 FOLLOW UP ON THE MARKET THEME THAT WE BEGAN

THESE
25 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS WITH. THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

1 THROUGH THE EFFORTS OF SENATOR KILLEA SOME YEARS 2 AGO, PASSED A MINIMUM CONTENT REQUIREMENT FOR 3 NEWSPRINT. AND I'M PLEASED TO STATE THAT THE NEWSPAPER INDUSTRY AND ITS MANY FACETS, NEWSPRINT 4 PRODUCERS AND USERS, HAVE SUCCESSFULLY CROSSED THE 5 6 50-PERCENT THRESHOLD FIVE YEARS AHEAD OF SCHEDULE. 7 SO THIS IS A, I THINK, A VERY 8 REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENT FOR THE STATE OF 9 CALIFORNIA, AND IT INDICATES A REMARKABLE DEGREE OF INVESTMENT AND WILLINGNESS BY THE PAPER 10 INDUSTRY IN ITS BROADEST SENSE TO PURSUE THIS 11 OBJECTIVE, NOT ONLY TO PURSUE IT, TO MEET IT AND 12 13 TO MEET IT WELL AHEAD OF SCHEDULE. THAT'S A RARITY IN ANY BUSINESS OF GOVERNMENT AND ATTESTS 14 TO, IN THIS CASE, I THINK, A PRIVATE AND PUBLIC 15 16 SECTOR PARTNERSHIP AND SUCCESSFUL ONE AT THAT. 17 SO I WOULD LIKE TO FIRST NOTE THE 18 FIRST CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION IS TO DR. 19 BONETTO, AND HE IS REPRESENTING THE PRINTING 20 INDUSTRIES OF CALIFORNIA. SO WE'LL TAKE A LITTLE 21 PHOTOGRAPH HERE. 22 (APPLAUSE.) 23 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AND THEN ROY 24 HERBURGER, JACK BATES, AND TOM NEWTON. 25 NEWTON, I DON'T KNOW WHO IS TAKING THE HONORS, BUT

1 THE NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS. WITHOUT THE PUBLISHERS BUYING THE PAPER, IT WOULDN'T WORK. SO VERY 2 3 HAPPY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 4 (APPLAUSE.) 5 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AND FINALLY, JAMES 6 TISDALE, WHO IS HERE REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN 7 FOREST AND PAPER ASSOCIATION. AND WITHOUT -- THE 8 AMERICAN FOREST PAPER -- FOREST AND PAPER 9 ASSOCIATION HAS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT IT IS IN THE 10 PROCESS OF A \$10 BILLION INVESTMENT IN SECONDARY 11 CAPACITY OR THE ABILITY TO USE RECYCLED PAPER IN 12 THE UNITED STATES. AND THIS IS GOING TO PUT US, NOT ONLY HERE IN CALIFORNIA, BUT THROUGHOUT THE 13 14 UNITED STATES AT A WORLD STANDARD FOR THE 15 CONSUMPTION OF OLD PAPER AND MAKING IT INTO NEW. 16 SO THIS IS A VERY, VERY IMPORTANT ACHIEVEMENT FOR 17 THE INDUSTRY. AND DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO TELL 18 US? MR. TISDALE: WELL, I WANT TO THANK THE 19 20 USERS HERE IN CALIFORNIA, BOTH THE NEWSPAPERS AND 21 THE COMMERCIAL PRINTERS, AS WELL AS THE 22 COOPERATION THAT WE'VE HAD IN WORKING WITH THE 23 BOARD AND STAFF IN COMPLYING WITH REGULATIONS. 2.4 AND WITHOUT THAT COMMITMENT ON THE PART OF THE

PRIVATE SECTOR AND THE GOVERNMENT SECTOR WORKING

25

- 1 TOGETHER, NONE OF THIS WOULD HAVE HAPPENED. SO I 2 THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 3 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 4 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. WE THANK YOU 5 VERY MUCH. AND AS AN ASSOCIATE MEMBER OF CNPA, I 6 LIKE TO SEE MY DUES GOING TO WORK THERE, 50 BUCKS 7 A YEAR. 8 YES, MR. CHESBRO. 9 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I AM ALSO VERY, VERY PLEASED AND PROUD OF THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE 10 PRIVATE SECTOR. I DID WANT TO POINT OUT AT THE 11 SEPTEMBER MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING, I, 12 13 WITH THE CONSENSUS OF THE OTHER MEMBERS, DID ASK STAFF TO INVESTIGATE WHY THE STATE PRINTING OFFICE 14 REPORTEDLY IS CURRENTLY USING 15 PERCENT RECYCLED 15 16 CONTENT. IN THE CATEGORY OF WALKING YOUR TALK, 17 I'M HOPING THAT THE STATE WILL SOON CATCH UP TO 18 THE OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE THAT WE'VE SEEN FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR HERE. SO I JUST WANTED TO MAKE 19 20 SURE THE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS WERE AWARE THAT THAT 21 HAD TAKEN PLACE. I KNOW THE MEMBERS OF THE 22 COMMITTEE WERE. 23 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: YES. MR. PENNINGTON
- 24 AND I SOME MONTHS AGO SENT OUT A LETTER TO THE 25 DIFFERENT AGENCIES REGARDING THE MINIMUM -- THE

1 PROCUREMENT STANDARDS. AND, YES, WE'RE HOPEFUL 2 THAT THE STATE OFFICE PRINTING WILL GET ON BOARD 3 WITH A HIGHER RATE OF RECOVERY SOON. BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MY PURPOSE IS NOT 4 TO DIMINISH THE ACHIEVEMENT AS TO CAST A LITTLE 5 6 SHAME ON OURSELVES AND TRY TO HOPE THAT WE CATCH 7 UP AND AT THE SAME TIME CONGRATULATING THE PRIVATE SECTOR FOR ITS OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE. 8 9 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. NEXT IS ITEM 23, CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE 10 DECLARATION AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE 11 SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING REGULATIONS. AND 12 13 WE HAVE JUDY FRIEDMAN HERE. 14 MS. FRIEDMAN: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON AND BOARD MEMBERS. THE FOLLOWING THREE 15 ITEMS, AGENDA ITEMS 23, 24, AND 25, ARE 16 17 REGULATIONS FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION FOR FINAL 18 ADOPTION. THESE REGULATIONS DEAL WITH THE CONTENT AND PROCEDURES FOR LOCAL PLANNING ELEMENTS. 19 20 THEY WERE ENACTED ON JANUARY 3, 1994, AS EMERGENCY REGULATIONS, AND THE BOARD HAD 21 22 THREE YEARS THROUGH SPECIAL STATUTORY DISPENSATION 23 IN WHICH TO MAKE THEM PERMANENT. FOR EACH AGENDA

ITEM THERE WILL BE TWO MOTIONS FOR ADOPTION:

ON THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND ONE ON THE

24

25

REGULATIONS THEMSELVES.

1

17

18

- 2 I'LL NOW INTRODUCE CHRIS DEIDRICK, 3 WHO WILL GIVE THE PRESENTATION FOR STAFF ON ALL OF 4 THE AGENDA ITEMS. 5 MR. DEIDRICK: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN 6 PENNINGTON, BOARD MEMBERS. I'M SORRY THIS MORNING 7 I DON'T HAVE ANY AWARDS TO OFFER, BUT I'D LIKE TO 8 PRESENT FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION THE 9 NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS AND PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PLANNING REGULATIONS CONTAINED IN ARTICLE 6.2, 10 6.4, AND 7.0. 11 12 THESE REGULATIONS ARE IN TITLE 14 OF 13 THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, DIVISION 7, CHAPTER 9. AS STATED IN ITEMS 23, 24, AND 25, TO 14 COMPLY WITH THE CHANGES IN STATUTE, THE BOARD 15 FILED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 6.2, 6.4, AND 7.0 WITH 16
- THE BOARD NOW HAS THREE YEARS IN

 ORDER TO MAKE THESE REGULATIONS PERMANENT, AND

 THAT BRINGS US TO JANUARY 3, 1997, TO ADOPT

 PERMANENT REGULATIONS AND OBTAIN OFFICE OF

 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW APPROVAL OR THE EMERGENCY
 LANGUAGE IN THESE REGULATIONS WOULD BE REPEALED.

THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW ON JANUARY 3,

1994. STATUTE ALLOWED THE EMERGENCY LANGUAGE TO

1 THE 45-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW FOR THE 2 AMENDMENTS OF THESE ARTICLES ENDED ON OCTOBER 28, 3 1996. BOARD STAFF HELD ONE PUBLIC HEARING ON NOVEMBER 4, 1996. WHAT FOLLOWS IS AN UPDATE ON 4 5 THE STATUS OF THE ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE 6 DECLARATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS. 7 THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY 8 ACT OR CEOA REQUIRES THAT POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL 9 IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH AMENDMENT AND IMPLEMEN-TATION OF THESE REGULATIONS BE ASSESSED WITHIN THE 10 SCOPE OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT. FROM EACH --11 12 OR FOR EACH OF THE AMENDED ARTICLES, STAFF 13 PREPARED AN INITIAL STUDY AND A PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND FILED THEM WITH THE STATE 14 CLEARINGHOUSE FOR PUBLICATION OR PUBLIC CIRCULA-15 TION ON OCTOBER 3, 1996. 16 17 THE CEOA PUBLIC NOTICES WERE 18 PUBLISHED IN THE "LOS ANGELES TIMES," THE "SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE, " AND THE "SACRAMENTO BEE" ON 19 OCTOBER 4, 1996. THE REVIEW PERIOD FOR CEQA 20 CLOSED ON NOVEMBER 4, 1996. 21 22 BOARD STAFF RECEIVED NO COMMENTS 23 DURING THIS REVIEW PERIOD. IN ADDITION, THE STATE 24 CLEARINGHOUSE HAS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE BOARD HAS 25 COMPLIED WITH THE STATE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW

1 REQUIREMENTS FOR DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS 2 PURSUANT TO CEOA. 3 WHAT FOLLOWS IS A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC REVIEW FOR 4 EACH AMENDED ARTICLE. STAFF RECEIVED SIX COMMENT 5 6 LETTERS, AND ONE PERSON PRESENTED COMMENTS AT THE 7 PUBLIC HEARING FOR ARTICLE 6.2, THE SOURCE 8 REDUCTION/RECYCLING ELEMENT REGULATIONS. THESE 9 COMMENT LETTERS INCLUDED THREE GENERAL COMMENTS AND NINE SPECIFIC COMMENTS FROM THE CITY OF 10 FORTUNA, THE OJAI VALLEY SANITARY DISTRICT, THE 11 CITY OF SAN DIEGO, THE CITY OF OAKLAND, 12 13 CALIFORNIANS AGAINST WASTE, THE REGIONAL COUNCIL OF RURAL COUNTIES, AND INSTITUTE OF SCRAP 14 15 RECYCLING INDUSTRIES. MOST OF THE COMMENTS WERE OUTSIDE 16 17 THE SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED REGULATORY CHANGES 18 AND/OR WOULD REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE CHANGE; HOWEVER, SOME MINOR CHANGES WERE MADE IN RESPONSE TO THESE 19 20 COMMENTS. 21 STAFF RECEIVED TWO COMMENT LETTERS 22 AND NO ONE PRESENTED COMMENTS AT THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR ARTICLE 6.4, THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY 23 24 ELEMENT REGULATIONS. THESE COMMENT LETTERS 25 INCLUDED ONE GENERAL COMMENT AND ONE SPECIFIC

1 COMMENT FROM THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO AND THE 2 CALIFORNIA TRADE AND COMMERCE AGENCY. BASED ON THESE COMMENTS, MINOR CHANGES WERE MADE TO THE 3 4 TEXT OF ARTICLE 6.4. 5 FINALLY, STAFF RECEIVED THREE 6 COMMENT LETTERS AND ONE PERSON PRESENTED COMMENTS 7 AT THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR ARTICLE 7, THE 8 PROCEDURES FOR PREPARING AND REVISING CITY, 9 COUNTY, REGIONAL AGENCY SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS, HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE 10 ELEMENTS, AND NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENTS. 11 12 THESE COMMENT LETTERS INCLUDED TWO GENERAL 13 COMMENTS AND 14 SPECIFIC COMMENTS FROM THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, THE WEST CONTRA COSTA INTEGRATED WASTE 14 15 MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY, THE WASTE SYSTEM DIVISION, 16 AND THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO. 17 MOST OF THE COMMENTS WERE OUTSIDE 18 THE SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED REGULATORY CHANGES AND/OR WOULD REQUIRE LEGISLATIVE CHANGE. NO 19 20 CHANGES WERE MADE BASED ON THESE COMMENTS. 21 THIS CONCLUDES THE UPDATE ON THE 22 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLES 6.2, 6.4, AND 7.0. 23 BASED ON THE COMMENTS RECEIVED, 24 STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD CONSIDER THE 25 FOLLOWING: ONE, FOR AGENDA ITEM NO. 23, ADOPT

- 1 NEGATIVE DECLARATION, RESOLUTION NO. 96-500, AND
- 2 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 6.2, RESOLUTION NO.
- 3 96-499, AND DIRECT STAFF TO FORWARD THEM TO THE
- 4 OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW.
- 5 TWO, FORWARD AGENDA ITEM -- FOR
- 6 AGENDA ITEM NO. 24, ADOPT NEGATIVE DECLARATION,
- 7 RESOLUTION NO. 96-502, AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS
- 8 TO ARTICLE 6.4, RESOLUTION NO. 501, AND DIRECT
- 9 STAFF TO FORWARD THEM TO THE OFFICE OF
- 10 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW.
- 11 AND THREE, FOR AGENDA NO. 25, ADOPT
- 12 THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION, RESOLUTION NO. 96-504,
- AND THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE 7.0,
- 14 RESOLUTION NO. 503, AND DIRECT STAFF TO FORWARD
- 15 THEM TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW.
- 16 THIS ENDS MY REPORT.
- 17 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU.
- 18 ANY QUESTIONS FROM BOARD MEMBERS FOR STAFF? OKAY.
- 19 YOU NEED THIS TO BE DONE IN THREE MOTIONS?
- MS. TOBIAS: SIX.
- MS. FRIEDMAN: YEAH, WE NEED SIX.
- 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: SURE.
- BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: MR. CHAIR, I'LL
- 24 MOVE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 96-500, WHICH IS THE
- 25 NEGATIVE DECLARATION ON 6.2.

1	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND.						
2	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND						
3	SECONDED. WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL.						
4	BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.						
5	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.						
6	BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.						
7	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.						
8	BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH.						
9	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.						
10	BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.						
11	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.						
12	BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.						
13	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE.						
14	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: THEN I'LL MOVE						
15	ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 96-499 IS THE REGULATION						
16	ITSELF ON 6.2.						
17	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND.						
18	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MOVED AND SECONDED.						
19	WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL.						
20	BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.						
21	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.						
22	BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.						
23	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE:						
AYE.							
24 25	BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH. BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.						

1	BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.							
2	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.							
3	BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.							
4	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE.							
5	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AND NEXT, ADOPTION							
6	OF RESOLUTION 96-502 IS THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION							
7	ON ARTICLE 6.4.							
8	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND.							
9	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MOVED AND SECONDED.							
10	WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL.							
11	BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.							
12	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.							
13	BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.							
14	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.							
15	BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH.							
16	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.							
17	BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.							
18	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.							
19	BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.							
20	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE.							
21	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AND NEXT THE							
22	RESOLUTION 96-501 IS THE REGULATIONS ON ARTICLE							
23	6.4.							
BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MOVED AND SECONDED.								

1	WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL.
2	BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.
3	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.
4	BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.
5	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.
6	BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH.
7	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.
8	BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.
9	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
10	BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.
11	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE.
12	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AND THEN RESOLUTION
13	96-504 IS THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION ON ARTICLE 7.0.
14	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND.
15	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MOVED AND SECONDED.
16	WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL.
17	BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.
18	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.
19	BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.
20	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.
21	BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH.
22	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.
23	BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.
24 25	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE. BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.

1 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. 2 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AND THEN FINALLY, 3 MOVE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 96-503. THIS IS THE 4 REGULATIONS ON 7.0. 5 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: SECOND. 6 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IT'S MOVED AND 7 SECONDED. WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL. 8 BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO. 9 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE. 10 BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE. 11 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE. 12 BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH. 13 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE. 14 BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS. BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE. 15 16 BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON. 17 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. OKAY. 18 NOW WE'LL MOVE TO ITEM 28, CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO 19 20 THE RECYCLED-CONTENT TRASH BAG REGULATION 21 PERTAINING TO THE PETITION FOR VARIANCE FOR 22 ADHESIVE, HEAT AFFIXED STRAP BAGS. 23 MS. TRGOVCICH: GOOD MORNING, MR. 24 CHAIRMAN. THE ITEM BEFORE YOU THIS MORNING IS THE 25 TRASH BAG REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE PETITION

1 FOR VARIANCE, AS YOU STATED. 2 THIS ITEM WAS FORWARDED TO THE BOARD 3 FROM COMMITTEE WITH A SPECIFIC REQUEST FOR FOLLOW-UP ON THREE ITEMS. THE FIRST ITEM WAS TO 4 5 PROVIDE MORE DETAILED RESPONSE TO COMMENTS. AS 6 YOU WILL RECALL FROM THE COMMITTEE MEETING, THERE 7 WERE COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY MULTIPLE PARTIES AT THE 8 DAY OF THE HEARING AND IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO THE 9 HEARING. SO WE HAVE PRESENTED TO YOU, I 10 BELIEVE WE ROUTED IT TO YOUR OFFICES YESTERDAY, 11 12 THE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS. WE ALSO FAX'D THOSE 13 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS TO INTERESTED PARTIES AS WELL. JERRY HART WILL BE MAKING THAT 14 15 PRESENTATION. 16 JERRY WILL ALSO BE DESCRIBING FOR 17 YOU OR PROVIDING FOR YOU AN APPROXIMATE TIME FRAME 18 FOR PROCESSING A VARIANCE UNDER THE REGULATIONS GIVEN THE EXISTING TIMETABLE THAT WE ARE UNDER AND 19 20 THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO PROCEED WITH AN 21 ADDITIONAL 15-DAY COMMENT PERIOD. 22 AND DEBBIE BORZELLERI OF THE LEGAL 23 STAFF WILL RESPOND TO THE TWO SPECIFIC ISSUES 24 RAISED FOR THE LEGAL OFFICE TO FOLLOW UP ON. I'LL 25 TURN THE PRESENTATION OVER TO JERRY NOW FOR A

1 SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS. 2 MR. HART: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN, 3 BOARD MEMBERS. MY NAME IS JERRY HART. I'VE BEEN THE LEAD STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RECYCLED-4 5 CONTENT TRASH BAG PROGRAM SINCE ITS INCEPTION IN 6 1991. 7 AS CAREN REVIEWED, WE HAD THE 8 INITIAL COMMENT PERIOD BEGINNING IN SEPTEMBER 9 FOLLOWING DIRECTION BY MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE TO INCORPORATE THE LIST OF EVIDENCE AND 10 A CRITERIA TO PROCESS A PETITION FOR A VARIANCE TO 11 THE RECYCLED-CONTENT TRASH BAG REQUIREMENTS IN 12 13 BOTH A POLICY AND IN REGULATIONS. AT THE SEPTEMBER BOARD MEETING, THE 14 ITEM WAS PULLED OFF CONSENT CALENDAR, WHICH 15 16 EVENTUALLY RESULTED IN THE REMOVAL OF THE POLICY 17 OPTION. THEREFORE, WE PROCEEDED ONLY WITH THE 18 REGULATION PROCESS. WE CONCLUDED THE 45-DAY COMMENT 19 20 PERIOD ON NOVEMBER 6TH PRIOR TO THE NOVEMBER 7TH 21 MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING. DURING THE 22 45-DAY COMMENT PERIOD, WE RECEIVED FOUR COMMENT 23 LETTERS. AND ON THE OVERHEAD HERE, I HAVE A 24 SUMMARY OF THOSE COMMENTS AND SUMMARY OF BOARD

STAFF'S RESPONSE TO THOSE COMMENTS. ALSO, ON THE

25

1 BACK TABLE ARE COPIES OF THE COMMENTS AND RESPONSE 2 TO COMMENTS AS WELL AS THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO 3 THE REGULATIONS AS A RESULT OF THESE COMMENT 4 LETTERS. 5 THE FIRST COMMENT WE RECEIVED 6 SUGGESTED THAT THE PETITIONER ONLY NEED TO PROVIDE 7 EVIDENCE THAT TWO FACTORS EXISTED. ONE WAS THAT 8 THERE WERE TECHNOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN USING 9 POSTCONSUMER MATERIAL IN THE HEAT AFFIXED STRAP BAGS, AND THE OTHER FACTOR THAT NEEDED TO BE 10 11 ESTABLISHED WAS THAT THESE TYPE OF BAGS, THE HEAT 12 AFFIXED STRAP BAGS, WERE PRODUCED BY THAT 13 MANUFACTURER PRIOR TO 1-1-95. THE COMMENT SUGGESTED THAT IF THE PETITIONER COULD SHOW THESE 14 TWO FACTORS, THAT THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED. 15 16 STAFF BELIEVES THAT THE STATUTE 17 ACTUALLY REQUIRES THE BOARD TO HEAR AND CONSIDER 18 ALL EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE VARIANCE. THE BOARD DOES NOT HAVE 19 20 THE AUTHORITY OR THE ABILITY TO DECIDE THAT ONLY Α 21 COUPLE FACTORS OR SEVERAL FACTORS OR ANY LIMIT ON22 THE AMOUNT OF EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT THE HEARING

IS

23	POSSIBLE.					
24		A	SECON	O COMMENT	r SUGGESTED	THAT
THE 25	REGULATIONS	MAY	NOT B	E NEEDED	TO PROCESS	THE

1 PETITION AT ALL. STAFF FEELS THAT IT'S CRITICAL TO PROVIDE THE PUBLIC, THE PETITIONING COMPANY, 2 3 AND ANY OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES WHO MAY WISH TO 4 PROVIDE TESTIMONY AT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE 5 PETITION A GUIDELINE, A FRAMEWORK, AN IDEA OF THE б TYPE OF INFORMATION THAT THE BOARD WOULD LIKE TO 7 SEE, WOULD LIKE TO HEAR, WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE 8 OPPORTUNITY TO EVALUATE IN ORDER TO MAKE ITS DECISION ON THE PETITION. 9 10 THEREFORE, WE FEEL THAT REGULATIONS 11 PROVIDE THESE GUIDELINES AND ARE REALLY CRITICAL 12 TO GIVING EVERYONE AN EQUAL SHOT AT PRESENTING TESTIMONY ON THE HEARING. 13 14 THE THIRD COMMENT SUGGESTED THE 15 PROPOSED REGULATIONS REPEAT STATUTE AND, 16 THEREFORE, THAT SPECIFIC ITEM WAS UNNECESSARY. 17 THAT PARTICULAR ITEM WAS A REQUIREMENT THAT THE 18 PETITIONING COMPANY PRODUCE EVIDENCE THAT SHOWS 19 THAT THEY MANUFACTURED THOSE BAGS PRIOR TO 1-1-95. 20 THAT'S A STATUTORY REQUIREMENT. 21 STAFF THROUGHOUT THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM HAS INCORPORATED PARTICULAR SECTIONS 22 23 OF THE STATUTE INTO THE REGULATIONS IN ORDER TO

24 KEEP ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROGRAM

CONTAINED

25 IN ONE DOCUMENT. THIS HAS BEEN WELL RECEIVED BY

THE REGULATED COMMUNITY. I THINK IT MAKES

1

UNDERSTANDING THE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS AND THE 2 3 RESPONSIBILITIES A LOT EASIER ON EVERYONE 4 INVOLVED, STAFF INCLUDED, AND THAT REPEATING OR 5 THAT INCORPORATING OF STATUTE IN THE REGULATIONS HAS ALSO BEEN APPROVED BY OAL IN PREVIOUS VERSIONS 6 7 OF THE REGULATIONS. THEREFORE, WE THINK IT 8 PROVIDES A VALUABLE SERVICE TO THE REGULATED COMMUNITY AND THE PUBLIC IN GENERAL. 9 10 ANOTHER COMMENT SUGGESTED THAT THE 11 BOARD SHOULD NOT CONSIDER A COMPANY'S ABILITY TO 12 COMPLY WITH THE ANNUAL AGGREGATE USE REQUIREMENTS FOR RPPCM IN THEIR MAKING A DETERMINATION ON THE 13 14 PETITION. STAFF BELIEVES THAT THIS IS ESSENTIAL 15 TO PROVIDING A FAIR, OPEN EVALUATION OF THE 16 PETITION. 17 A COMPANY'S ABILITY TO COMPLY WITH 18 THE USE REQUIREMENTS REALLY IS KIND OF A FIRST 19 QUESTION ONE MIGHT ASK IN DETERMINING THE NEED FOR 20 A VARIANCE. IF THE COMPANY CAN COMPLY WITHOUT THE 21 VARIANCE, WHY GRANT THE VARIANCE? WHY HAVE THE 22 HEARING? 23 STATUTE ALSO PROVIDES THE BOARD WITH AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS ON ANY VARIANCE 2.4 THAT IT MAY GRANT. AGAIN, A COMPANY'S ABILITY TO 25

- 1 ATTAIN THE USE REQUIREMENT OR TO COME CLOSE OR ITS PRESENTATION THAT SHOWS IT'S ABSOLUTELY INCAPABLE 2 3 OR UNABLE TO USE MUCH RPPCM AT ALL, AGAIN, WOULD 4 BE A BASIS FOR IMPOSING THOSE CONDITIONS ON THE 5 VARIANCE. SO WE THINK THAT ASKING FOR THIS TYPE 6 OF INFORMATION REGARDING A COMPANY'S ABILITY TO 7 COMPLY WITH THE USE REQUIREMENTS REALLY PROVIDES 8 SOMETHING VALUABLE TO THE BOARD IN MAKING THEIR 9 DECISION. 10 ANOTHER COMMENT SUGGESTS THAT THE 11 BOARD SHOULD NOT CONSIDER PROPRIETARY TRADE SECRET 12 OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. WITH THIS COMMENT STAFF AGREES AND, THEREFORE, HAS PROPOSED THE ONE 13 14 REVISION TO THE REGULATIONS AS A RESULT OF THESE 15 COMMENTS. STAFF HAS PROPOSED A REVISION TO THE INTRODUCTORY LANGUAGE ABOVE THE LIST OF EVIDENCE 16 TO NOT REQUIRE THE SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS, THE 17 SPECIFIC PIECES OF EVIDENCE LISTED. THE REVISION 18 19 OF THE REGULATIONS WOULD ALLOW THE PETITIONING 20 COMPANY TO SUBSTITUTE OTHER DOCUMENTS, TO PROVIDE SIMILAR INFORMATION, TO PROVIDE SUMMARY 21 22 INFORMATION, TO PROVIDE DOCUMENTS WITH THE TRADE 23 SECRET OR PROPRIETARY INFORMATION BLACKENED OUT OR
- 24 DELETED FROM THOSE DOCUMENTS SO THAT THE

1 ITS PRESENTATION WITHOUT REVEALING CONFIDENTIAL 2 INFORMATION. 3 STAFF BELIEVES THAT THE STATUTE 4 CLEARLY PROVIDES US DIRECTION IN THE PETITION 5 STATUTE WHERE IT DIRECTS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AND 6 PLACE INTO THE RECORD ALL INFORMATION, ALL DATA, 7 ALL EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT THE HEARING ON THE 8 PETITION. 9 ANOTHER COMMENT RECEIVED WAS THAT 10 THERE WERE NO NEED TO REQUEST SAMPLES. STAFF IDENTIFIED IN ITS LIST OF CRITERIA THAT THE BOARD 11 WOULD LIKE TO SEE SAMPLES OF THE HEAT AFFIXED 12 13 STRAP BAG, WHICH ARE THE SUBJECT OF THE PETITION. 14 AND THE COMMENT SUGGESTED WAS THAT THEY WERE PLANNING TO DO THIS ANYWAY AND THAT THERE WAS NO 15 NEED TO SPECIFICALLY REQUEST SAMPLES. 16 17 AND I THINK THIS, AGAIN, KIND OF GOES DIRECTLY AT THE NEED FOR THE LIST OF 18 19 EVIDENCE, FOR THE CRITERIA, THAT BY LISTING THIS 20 TYPE OF INFORMATION AND THE CRITERIA BY WHICH THE 21 INFORMATION WILL BE WEIGHED, WILL BE EVALUATED BY 22 THE BOARD, IT GIVES EVERYONE, THE PETITIONING COMPANY, STAFF, AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES WHO 23

MAY BE PROVIDING TESTIMONY AT THE PUBLIC HEARING,

HEAR, WANTS TO SEE, WANTS TO EVALUATE. THEN 1 THERE'S NO QUESTION. 2 3 IF WE DIDN'T LIST SAMPLES OR WE 4 DIDN'T LIST SOME OTHER TYPE OF INFORMATION, THAT 5 INFORMATION MAY NOT BE ADDRESSED; AND, THEREFORE, б THE PETITIONING COMPANY AND THE PUBLIC IN GENERAL 7 MAY HAVE A LEGITIMATE ARGUMENT, THAT THERE WAS NO 8 GUIDANCE. WE DID THE BEST WE CAN WITHOUT ANY GUIDANCE FROM THE BOARD, AND IT ESSENTIALLY WAS 9 10 PRESENTING INFORMATION IN THE DARK, AND IT WAS 11 EITHER A HIT-OR-MISS SITUATION. THIS WAY WE GIVE 12 EVERYBODY INVOLVED A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT'S EXPECTED, WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO LOOK FOR WITH THE 13 14 EXCEPTION OF A REQUIREMENT TO REVEAL PROPRIETARY 15 AND TRADE SECRET INFORMATION. 16 AGAIN, THEREFORE, WE THINK THE LIST AND THE CRITERIA ARE ESSENTIAL TO PROVIDING A 17 18 FAIR, EVEN, OPEN FORUM FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING ON 19 THE PETITION. 20 ONE OF THE LAST COMMENTS REQUESTED 21 WAS -- OR REQUESTED THAT THE BOARD ADD A SIXTH 22 ITEM TO THE LIST OF EVIDENCE REQUESTING MORE 23 EMPIRICAL DATA TO EVALUATE THE PETITION. IN THE 24 PROPOSED LIST OF EVIDENCE, WE HAVE AN ITEM, I

BELIEVE IT'S NO. 4, WHICH DOES REQUEST TEST

1 RESULTS DATA TO DOCUMENT, TO PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR THE BOARD TO EVALUATE ON A COMPANY'S ABILITY 2 3 TO USE POSTCONSUMER MATERIAL. IT REQUESTS 4 INFORMATION FROM THE SUPPLIERS OF THE POSTCONSUMER 5 MATERIAL ON THAT MATERIAL. THEREFORE, WE THINK б THAT THIS ITEM HAS BEEN ADDRESSED. AGAIN, WE'RE 7 GIVING THEM A HEADS-UP THAT THIS IS THE TYPE OF 8 INFORMATION THAT THE BOARD WANTS TO SEE. AND WE DON'T THINK ADDING ANOTHER ITEM WOULD HELP CLARIFY 9 10 THE LIST OF EVIDENCE. 11 FINALLY, WE HAVE A SUGGESTION THAT 12 THE BOARD PROVIDE A CLEARER STATEMENT OF THE STATE'S INTEREST IN WASTE MINIMIZATION AND WASTE 13 14 DIVERSION, AND THE BOARD'S INTEREST IN SEEING THAT 15 INFORMATION PRESENTED TO EVALUATE THE PETITION. 16 AGAIN, WE HAVE THE LAST CRITERIA THAT ADDRESSES 17 THE BOARD'S INTEREST IN HOW THE PETITION WOULD 18 AFFECT WASTE MINIMIZATION AND DIVERSION IN THE 19 STATE. WE FEEL IT ADEQUATELY GIVES THE PUBLIC, THE PETITIONING COMPANY, AND STAFF AN IDEA OF WHAT 20 21 THEY'RE GOING LOOKING FOR AND HOW THAT INFORMATION 22 WILL BE EVALUATED, AND, AGAIN, FEELS, AS WRITTEN, 23 THE CRITERIA IS ADEQUATE.

THEREFORE, WE'RE LEFT WITH THE ONE

PROPOSED REVISION TO THE REGULATIONS. THIS IS

2.4

MAYBE NOT SO EASY TO SEE. BUT WE'RE AGAIN

1

25

ADDRESSING THE -- AS PREVIOUSLY WRITTEN, WE WERE 2 3 NOT ADDRESSING A COMPANY'S NEED OR ABILITY TO 4 PROVIDE CONFIDENTIAL TRADE SECRET OR PROPRIETARY 5 INFORMATION. THEREFORE, WE'RE SAYING IF PROVIDING 6 ANY OF THIS INFORMATION IDENTIFIED IN THE LIST OF 7 EVIDENCE WOULD REQUIRE YOU TO DO SO, AGAIN, YOU 8 MAY SUBSTITUTE DOCUMENTS OR PROVIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION OR PROVIDE THAT INFORMATION SO THAT 9 10 YOU, THEREFORE, WOULD NOT BE REVEALING ANYTHING 11 THAT COULD BE CONSIDERED TRADE SECRET, PROPRIETARY, OR CONFIDENTIAL. 12 THE LIST OF EVIDENCE, THE CRITERIA 13 14 REMAINS THE SAME AS PROPOSED. THE PROPOSED 15 REVISION TO THE REGULATIONS WOULD REQUIRE AN ADDITIONAL 15-DAY COMMENT PERIOD, AGAIN, ON THIS 16 17 ONE PARAGRAPH. THAT WOULD PUT US INTO THE JANUARY MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING OR PERHAPS 18 19 THE JANUARY BOARD MEETING IF IT WAS THE BOARD'S 20 DESIRE TO SKIP THE COMMITTEE AND COME DIRECTLY TO 21 THE BOARD. THAT WOULD HAPPEN IN JANUARY. IF ALL 22 WENT WELL IN JANUARY, WE WOULD THEN BE SUBMITTING 23 THE RULEMAKING FILE TO OAL. 2.4 THEY HAVE 30 CALENDAR DAYS TO REVIEW

THE FILE AND EITHER APPROVE OR NOTIFY THE BOARD

1 THAT CHANGES ARE REQUIRED. THAT WOULD PUT US INTO MARCH, PERHAPS, FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING AND THE 2 3 MARCH BOARD MEMBER FOR THE BOARD MEETING FOR THE ACTUAL PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PETITION. 4 5 AGAIN, THERE'S A COUPLE OF 6 OPPORTUNITIES TO SHORT-CIRCUIT THAT OR SHORTCUT 7 THAT TIME FRAME WITH THE BOARD'S DISCRETION OF 8 COMING BACK TO BOARD DIRECTLY RATHER THAN THE 9 COMMITTEE AT THE END OF THIS 15-DAY COMMENT PERIOD. I BELIEVE WE ALSO HAVE THE ABILITY TO GO 10 AHEAD AND USE THE BOARD ADOPTED REGULATIONS TO 11 12 HEAR THE PUBLIC HEARING WITHOUT HAVING OAL 13 APPROVAL. THAT WOULD SAVE AT LEAST 30 OR 40 CALENDAR DAYS. BUT, IN ESSENCE, WE'RE PROBABLY 14 LOOKING AT SOMETIME OF MARCH '97 TIME FRAME FOR 15 THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PETITION. 16 17 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. ANY 18 QUESTIONS OF THE STAFF? MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, I BELIEVE 19 20 THE LEGAL STAFF WOULD LIKE TO PRESENT A SUMMARY OF THEIR ANALYSIS ON THE TWO SPECIFIC POINTS 21 22 REQUESTED AT THE LAST COMMITTEE MEETING AS WELL. 23 MS. BORZELLERI: MORNING, MR. CHAIR AND

BOARD MEMBERS. DEBORAH BORZELLERI FROM THE

LEGAL

25 OFFICE.

1 WE HAD TWO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS THAT 2 WERE ASKED AT THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 3 MEETING, AND I WANTED TO ADDRESS THOSE. WE HAVE DONE A LEGAL ANALYSIS ON BOTH OF THEM AND WANTED 4 5 TO GIVE YOU INFORMATION AS REQUESTED. 6 THE FIRST QUESTION IS SORT OF AN 7 OVERARCHING QUESTION ABOUT THE REGULATIONS AS THEY 8 WERE PROPOSED AND WHETHER THEY ARE, IN FACT, 9 LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH THE STATUTE AS IT'S WRITTEN. AND I WANTED TO JUST GO THROUGH THAT 10 11 BRIEFLY. WE LOOKED AT THAT AND WE BELIEVE THE 12 13 LAW STATES THAT THE ULTIMATE DETERMINATION OF CONSISTENCY WOULD BE MADE BY A COURT, BUT WE'VE 14 DONE OUR BEST TO THAT MAKE INTERPRETATION FOR YOU. 15 16 THE BASIC STANDARD THEY WOULD LOOK AT IS A PLAIN 17 MEANING INTERPRETATION OF THE STATUTE. AND IF 18 THEY FOUND THAT THE BOARD MADE ITS OWN REASONABLE INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTED THAT WAY, THEN THE 19 20 REGULATIONS WOULD BE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT. 21 A FUNDAMENTAL RULE IN STATUTORY 22 INTERPRETATION IS THAT WE LOOK AT THE STATUTE AS A 23 WHOLE, AND I THINK WE'VE DONE THAT. THERE ARE TWO 24 BASIC PROVISIONS IN SECTION 42298 THAT ADDRESS

THE BROADER PURPOSE OF THE STATUTE IS TO

1 IMPOSE MINIMUM POSTCONSUMER REQUIREMENTS ON 2 MANUFACTURERS. IN THIS CASE PLASTIC TRASH BAG 3 MANUFACTURERS THAT PRODUCE BAGS WITH HEAT AFFIXED STRAPS WERE EXEMPTED FROM THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE 4 5 YEAR 1996. AND THEN, OF COURSE, THAT THE 6 ADDITIONAL PROVISION ALLOWS THEM TO PETITION THE 7 BOARD TO ALLOW FOR THE EXTENSION OF THAT 8 EXEMPTION. 9 THE PROVISION REQUIRES THE BOARD TO HOLD A HEARING AND HEAR ALL EVIDENCE RELATED TO 10 THE PETITION, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO 11 12 TECHNOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS. AND THE PROVISION 13 FURTHER ALLOWS THE BOARD TO IMPOSE CONDITIONS ON ANY VARIANCE GRANTED THAT WOULD REQUIRE THE 14 PETITIONER TO COMPLY TO SOME OR ALL OF THE STATUTE 15 16 BASED ON THE BOARD'S DETERMINATION OF THE 17 PETITIONER'S ABILITY TO COMPLY. 18 WE THINK THAT THOSE TWO BASIC ISSUES ARE ADDRESSED IN THE REGULATIONS. INFORMATION 19 20 THAT WE GAIN FROM THE REQUIREMENTS IN THE 21 REGULATIONS WILL ALLOW THE BOARD TO LOOK AT 22 WHETHER THE PETITIONER CAN IN FACT COMPLY, AND WE 23 THINK THAT'S APPROPRIATE. IF THE PETITIONER IS 24 OTHERWISE ABLE TO COMPLY WITH THE STATUTE, THEN IT 25 WOULD RENDER THE VARIANCE UNNECESSARY. AND THEN

- 1 REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE PETITIONER CAN COMPLY,
 2 THE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WILL ALLOW THE BOARD TO
- 3 IMPOSE ANY ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS THAT THEY WANT.
- 4 SO WE DO MAKE A FINDING THAT THE
- 5 REGULATIONS AS WRITTEN ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE
- 6 STATUTE. AND THEN IT'S UP TO THE BOARD TO
- 7 DETERMINE IF THEY WANT TO ADOPT THEM AS THEY ARE
- 8 WRITTEN.
- 9 THE OTHER QUESTION THAT THE BOARD
- 10 ASKED IS WHAT IS IRONCLAD'S STATUS IF THE BOARD
- 11 DOESN'T GRANT THE VARIANCE PRIOR TO JANUARY 1,
- 12 '97. AND WE BELIEVE THAT SINCE IRONCLAD'S FILED
- 13 THEIR PETITION ALREADY, THEY'RE IN COMPLIANCE WITH
- 14 THE PETITION PORTION OF THE STATUTE, AND THEY'RE
- 15 PENDING A DETERMINATION, BUT THEY WILL BE
- 16 CONSIDERED NEITHER IN COMPLIANCE OR OUT OF
- 17 COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATUTE AFTER JANUARY 1.
- 18 IF A VARIANCE IS GRANTED, IT WILL
- 19 BECOME OPERATIVE JANUARY 1, '97. IF THE
- 20 DETERMINATION IS MADE AFTER JANUARY 1, '97, THE
- 21 VARIANCE WILL BE RETROACTIVE TO JANUARY 1, '97.
- 22 SO THERE WON'T BE AN ISSUE. IF THE VARIANCE

ISN'T

- GRANTED, OF COURSE, AS I MENTIONED BEFORE,
- 24 IRONCLAD WILL BE STATUTORILY REQUIRED TO COME

INTO

25 COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATUTE BECAUSE THEIR AUTO-

1 MATIC EXEMPTION EXPIRES ON DECEMBER 31, '96. IF 2 THE DETERMINATION ON THE VARIANCE IS MADE AFTER 3 JANUARY 1, '97, THEN IT'S UP TO THE BOARD TO MAKE A DECISION AS TO WHETHER THEY WANT TO IMPOSE ANY 4 SORT OF ENFORCEMENT OR COMPLIANCE AUTHORITY ON 5 6 IRONCLAD FOR NOT COMPLYING AS OF JANUARY 1. 7 CERTIFICATIONS FOR COMPLIANCE WILL 8 NOT BE REQUIRED UNTIL MARCH OF '98, SO THE ISSUE 9 WON'T ACTUALLY BE RAISED UNTIL THEN AS TO WHETHER THEY'RE IN COMPLIANCE OR NOT. ANY QUESTIONS? 10 11 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IF THEY -- YOU ARE NOT -- WE DON'T FIND OUT WHETHER THEY'RE IN 12 13 COMPLIANCE OR NOT UNTIL '98? 14 MS. BORZELLERI: RIGHT BECAUSE WE LOOK AT 15 THE ENTIRE YEAR. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: SO COULD WE --16 17 COULD WE ISSUE A TEMPORARY VARIANCE UNTIL WE GET 18 THROUGH ALL THE OTHER? MS. BORZELLERI: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE DON'T 19 20 FIND ANY AUTHORITY TO ISSUE A TEMPORARY VARIANCE, 21 AND THE STATUTE REQUIRES THAT THE BOARD HEAR 22 EVIDENCE AND MAKE A DETERMINATION. 23 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: SO THEY'RE AT RISK

EVEN THOUGH WE'RE AT FAULT?

MS. TRGOVCICH: I'D LIKE TO POINT OUT,

24

- 1 MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT AT THE SEPTEMBER MARKET
- 2 DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, THE MOTION WAS TO BOTH MOVE
- 3 FORWARD WITH REGULATIONS AND SIMULTANEOUSLY
- 4 PROCESS THE VARIANCE REQUEST. I BELIEVE THAT IT
- 5 WAS THE COMMENT OF IRONCLAD THAT THEY WISH TO WAIT
- 6 UNTIL THE REGULATIONS HAD MOVED THROUGH THE FORMAL
- 7 ADOPTION PROCESS TO WAIT FOR THAT PETITION TO BE
- 8 HEARD.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I BELIEVE WE WERE
- 10 RESPONDING TO IRONCLAD'S REQUEST AND INTEREST AT
- 11 THAT TIME.
- 12 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: RIGHT. I JUST
- 13 WONDERED IF WE -- IF WE, BY OUR OWN ACTIONS, PUSH
- 14 THIS OUT TO A DATE THAT'S PAST THE JANUARY 1 DATE
- AND THEY'RE AT RISK THEN, EVEN IF THAT'S OUR
- 16 DECISION. I UNDERSTAND. OKAY. OKAY.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: ON THE ISSUE OF
- 18 CONFIDENTIALITY AND TRADE INFORMATION, THE NEXT
- 19 ITEM, ITEM 29, DEALS WITH THAT AS A MATTER OF
- 20 POLICY, BUT AS I UNDERSTAND, WE'RE PUTTING THAT
- 21 ISSUE IN REGULATION -- AMENDED INTO REGULATION,
- THEN IS THERE NECESSITY TO GO AHEAD WITH THE
- 23 POLICY ITEM ON CONFIDENTIALITY ALSO?
- 24 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. FRAZEE, THE ITEM NO.
- 25 29 DOES NOT PERTAIN TO THE VARIANCE. IT PERTAINS

- 1 TO THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST AROUND THE PRIOR
- 2 YEARS' CERTIFICATIONS. SO THEIR CONFIDENTIALITY
- 3 IS ADDRESSED IN BOTH ITEMS; HOWEVER, ITEM NO. 29
- 4 PERTAINS SPECIFICALLY TO PRIOR YEAR CERTIFICATIONS
- 5 AND NOT A VARIANCE REQUEST.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: HAVE WE HAD ONE OF
- 7 THOSE? HAVE WE HAD A PRIOR YEAR CERTIFICATION?
- 8 MS. TRGOVCICH: YES. WE HAVE
- 9 CERTIFICATIONS GOING BACK, I BELIEVE, TO 1993.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: SO IN ADDITION TO
- 11 THE STATUTORY EXEMPTION PREVIOUSLY, WE ALSO HAVE
- 12 CONSIDERED COMPLIANCE WITH THAT?
- 13 MS. TRGOVCICH: COMPLIANCE WITH THE
- 14 PROVISIONS OF STATUTE. MAYBE JERRY CAN TAKE A
- 15 MOMENT TO SUMMARIZE WHAT THE YEAR-END
- 16 CERTIFICATIONS COVER.
- 17 MR. HART: YES. AS DEBORAH SUGGESTED, WE
- 18 HAVE -- WE COLLECT THE ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS.
- 19 THEY'RE DUE MARCH 1ST OF THE FOLLOWING YEAR FOR
- THE PREVIOUS CALENDAR YEAR REPORTING PERIOD. SO
- 21 WE HAVE ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS RECEIVED FROM
- 22 CERTIFYING TRASH BAG MANUFACTURERS FOR CALENDAR
- 23 YEAR '93, '94, AND '95.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: THAT'S ALL
- 25 MANUFACTURERS?

1 MR. HART: THAT'S CORRECT. AND WE HAVE HAD A PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FOR THE IRONCLAD'S 2 3 ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS SUBMITTED. SO WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IS DEAL WITH THAT PUBLIC RECORDS 4 5 REQUEST, WHICH WE'VE ALREADY RECEIVED AND NEED TO 6 RESPOND TO. AND DEFERRING -- WELL -- AND 7 CONSIDERING THE CONFIDENTIALITY ISSUES SURROUNDING 8 THE INFORMATION MAY BE PRESENTED DURING THE PUBLIC 9 HEARING EITHER LATER OR IN THIS REVISION TO THE REGULATIONS, WHICH WOULD MAKE IT UP TO THE 10 11 MANUFACTURER TO DECIDE WHETHER THEY WANTED TO 12 REVEAL THAT OR NOT. 13 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I SEE. OKAY. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS 14 15 OF STAFF? OKAY. MR. GENE LIVINGSTON TO ADDRESS 16 THIS. 17 MR. LIVINGSTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF 18 THE BOARD, MY NAME IS GENE LIVINGSTON WITH 19 LIVINGSTON & MATTESICH. WE REPRESENT IRONCLAD. 20 LET ME JUST SAY AT THE OUTSET WITH 21 RESPECT TO THE REGULATIONS THAT WE APPRECIATE THE 22 STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS TO MAKE THE CHANGE 23 ADDRESSING, AT LEAST TO A LIMITED EXTENT, THE 24 CONFIDENTIALITY CONCERN. 25 WE COULD BE FACED DESPITE THAT

1 CHANGE -- WHILE THAT CHANGE GIVES US MORE 2 FLEXIBILITY IN HOW TO PRESENT EVIDENCE, WHEN YOU 3 LOOK AT THE CRITERIA, WE COULD STILL BE PUT IN A CATCH 22 SITUATION WHERE THE ONLY WAY WE CAN PROVE 4 5 OR TO MEET THE CRITERIA THAT THE BOARD WOULD 6 CONSIDER IN MAKING A DECISION IS TO PRESENT 7 CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. AND AGAIN, I THINK THAT 8 GOES BEYOND REALLY THE SCOPE OF THE STATUTE. LET 9 ME ADDRESS THAT ISSUE SEPARATELY. MR. HART SAID, AS DID MS. 10 BORZELLERI, THAT THE PROVISION IN THE STATUTE THAT 11 12 SAYS THAT THE BOARD SHALL REVIEW AND ENTER INTO 13 THE RECORD ANY EVIDENCE PRESENTED ALSO PROVIDES A BASIS FOR THE BOARD REQUIRING ANY EVIDENCE THAT IT 14 MIGHT WANT TO REQUIRE, AND I READ THAT LANGUAGE 15 VERY DIFFERENTLY. IT SAYS THE BOARD SHALL ENTER 16 17 INTO THE RECORD AND REVIEW ANY EVIDENCE PRESENTED. 18 IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY LEAVE WIDE OPEN THE EVIDENCE THAT THE BOARD COULD REQUIRE IN MAKING A 19 20 DECISION ON THAT. 21 AND, FOR EXAMPLE, I'M PARTICULARLY 22 BOTHERED BY THE FAILURE OF THE REGULATIONS AND THE 23 EVIDENTIARY PORTION INITIALLY TO SAY ANYTHING AT 24 ALL ABOUT THE TECHNOLOGICAL ISSUES INVOLVED IN 25 ATTACHING A STRAP TO A TRASH BAG CONTAINING

1 POSTCONSUMER RECYCLED CONTENT. THAT'S WHAT THE 2 VARIANCE STATUTE IS ALL ABOUT. THAT'S WHAT OUR 3 EVIDENCE IS GOING TO BE ABOUT. THAT'S WHERE WE HAVE A DIFFICULTY. WE CANNOT ATTACH A STRAP TO A 4 5 BAG CONTAINING THE POSTCONSUMER RECYCLED CONTENT. 6 AND YET NOWHERE DOES THE EVIDENCE IN THIS PROPOSED 7 REGULATION REALLY ADDRESS THAT PARTICULAR ISSUE. 8 IN THE FIFTH EVIDENTIARY ITEM, IT 9 STILL BASICALLY PUTS THE BURDEN ON US TO DEMONSTRATE THAT WE CANNOT ATTAIN THE ANNUAL 10 AGGREGATE USE. AND AGAIN, AS I READ THE STATUTE, 11 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THAT GOES BEYOND THE 12 13 TECHNOLOGICAL ISSUE ABOUT AFFIXING STRAPS TO TRASH 14 BAGS. 15 THE CHANGE MADE, HOWEVER, AS I SAY, 16 DOES PROVIDE MORE FLEXIBILITY IN TERMS OF THE 17 EVIDENCE, BUT THE CRITERIA, I THINK, TAKES AWAY 18 THAT FLEXIBILITY TO A GREAT EXTENT. AND LET ME MAKE THREE POINTS WITH RESPECT TO THE CRITERIA. 19 20 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT IS OBVIOUS FROM THE 21 STATUTE, AND MR. HART POINTED THIS OUT, AND I HAD 22 ARGUED BEFORE THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 23 THAT IT WAS UNNECESSARY BECAUSE THE STATUTE 24 REQUIRES IT IS THAT -- THAT A COMPANY TO BE 25 ELIGIBLE FOR A VARIANCE HAS TO HAVE PRODUCED

1

ADHESIVE, HEAT AFFIXED STRAP TRASH BAGS PRIOR TO

JANUARY 1, 1995. AND, OF COURSE, THAT'S PART OF 2 3 THE EVIDENCE THAT THE REGULATIONS WOULD REQUIRE US 4 TO PRODUCE. AND YET NOWHERE IS THAT A CRITERIA 5 THAT THE BOARD IS GOING TO CONSIDER. IT SEEMS 6 LIKE AN OBVIOUS OMISSION THERE. 7 THE SECOND POINT IS THAT, AGAIN, THE ISSUE IS ARE WE PRECLUDED FROM TECHNOLOGICAL 8 LIMITATIONS FROM ATTACHING A STRAP TO A TRASH BAG 9 10 CONTAINING POSTCONSUMER RECYCLED CONTENT. 11 SEEMS TO ME TO BE AGAIN A FAIRLY OBVIOUS CRITERIA 12 THAT THE BOARD SHOULD LOOK AT, AND THAT'S NOT 13 INCLUDED IN THE CRITERIA AS WELL. 14 IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IF THE BOARD 15 WANTS TO ADOPT REGULATIONS -- AND IT'S TRUE THAT I 16 ARGUED BEFORE THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE 17 THAT LET'S HAVE A VARIANCE HEARING IN DECEMBER. LET'S GET THIS DONE -- MS. BORZELLERI'S REPORT IN 18 19 TERMS OF THE STATUS AND THE LEGAL EFFECT OF NOT 20 HAVING A VARIANCE BY JANUARY 1ST IS REASSURING, AT 21 LEAST TO THE EXTENT THAT I UNDERSTAND WHAT SHE WAS 22 REPORTING TO YOU. AND I'D LIKE TO FOLLOW UP ON 23 THAT, BUT AT LEAST IF WE'RE GOING TO ADOPT 24 REGULATIONS, LET'S MAKE THE CRITERIA CONSISTENT 25 WITH THE STATUTE. LET'S MAKE SURE THAT THE KINDS

1 OF EVIDENCE THAT I KNOW THAT'S GOING TO BE BEFORE YOU IS THE KIND OF EVIDENCE THAT YOU CAN CONSIDER 2 3 AND CAN BASE A DECISION ON THAT. 4 AND WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO URGE THIS 5 BOARD TO DO IS TO -- IS TO ENCOURAGE THE STAFF TO 6 MEET WITH THE STAKEHOLDERS -- IN PARTICULAR BY 7 THAT I MEAN IRONCLAD -- AND LET'S SEE IF WE CAN 8 WORK OUT THE DIFFERENCES, COME UP WITH A REGULATION THAT MAKES SENSE, THAT'S CONSISTENT 9 10 WITH THE STATUTE, THAT'S CONSISTENT WITH THE KIND 11 OF EVIDENCE THAT WE KNOW IS GOING TO BE PRESENTED 12 AND THAT GIVES YOU THE AUTHORITY TO MAKE A DECISION ON THE BASIS OF THE EVIDENCE THAT IS 13 14 RELEVANT AND THAT'S GOING TO BE BEFORE YOU. AND 15 I'D LIKE TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO THAT, AND I'D ASK YOU FOR YOUR HELP IN THAT REGARD. 16 17 WITH RESPECT TO THE STATUS OF IRONCLAD, MAYBE I COULD JUST FOLLOW UP A LITTLE 18 19 BIT WITH THAT. AS I UNDERSTAND, BASICALLY THE 20 STATUTE AND THE REGULATIONS REQUIRE A MANUFACTURER 21 TO ACHIEVE A CERTAIN AVERAGE IN ALL OF ITS TRASH 22 BAGS IN THE TWELVE-MONTH PERIOD, SO WE'RE TALKING 23 ABOUT JANUARY 1ST TO DECEMBER 31, 1997. AND SO 2.4 THAT IF IRONCLAD ACHIEVES THAT 30 PERCENT, IT 25 DOESN'T MATTER WHETHER IT MANUFACTURES STRAP BAGS

- 1 WITHOUT ANY POSTCONSUMER RECYCLED-CONTENT OR NOT.
- 2 IS THAT WHAT YOU WERE SAYING IN RESPONSE TO THE
- 3 CHAIRMAN'S QUESTION?
- 4 MS. BORZELLERI: YES.
- 5 MR. LIVINGSTON: SO THAT COME JANUARY
- 6 1ST, WE CAN CONTINUE TO MANUFACTURE THE STRAP BAG,
- 7 AND THAT THAT DOESN'T AFFECT, AS YOU SAID, WE'RE
- 8 NOT OUT OF COMPLIANCE AT THAT POINT, OUR BAGS ARE
- 9 NOT OUT OF COMPLIANCE.
- 10 MS. BORZELLERI: THAT IS CORRECT.
- 11 MR. LIVINGSTON: ALL RIGHT. I THINK THAT
- 12 THAT CAUSES ME TO FEEL MORE COMFORTABLE ABOUT THE
- 13 FACT THAT WE WILL NOT HAVE A VARIANCE HEARING
- 14 UNTIL MARCH AT THE EARLIEST AND I THINK WOULD
- 15 CAUSE ME TO SAY, "OKAY. IF YOU WANT TO GO AHEAD
- 16 WITH REGULATIONS, LET'S JUST WORK ON IT AND GET
- 17 THOSE REGULATIONS RIGHT THEN."
- 18 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. ANY
- 19 QUESTIONS OF MR. LIVINGSTON? OKAY. THANK YOU,
- MR. LIVINGSTON.
- 21 NEXT WE HAVE DARLENE RUIZ.
- MS. RUIZ: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 23 MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. DARLENE RUIZ HERE ON BEHALF
- 24 OF FIRST BRANDS CORPORATION TO COMMENT UPON A
- 25 RULEMAKING PACKAGE WHICH I BELIEVE IS EVOLVING

1 WITH A GREAT DEAL OF THOUGHTFULNESS AND CONSIDERA-2 TION, AND I APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS 3 YOU IN THIS FORUM. OUR CONTINUING CONCERN, IN LIGHT OF 4 5 THE PROPOSED CHANGES, WE RECOGNIZE THAT YOUR STAFF 6 IS HAVING A VERY DIFFICULT TIME. YOU ARE TRYING 7 TO WEIGH THE COMPLEXITIES OF CONFIDENTIALITY, TRADE SECRETS AGAINST THE PUBLIC HEARING AND THE 8 RIGHT OF THE PUBLIC TO MEANINGFULLY PARTICIPATE 9 BEFORE YOU. AND THEY CANNOT DO SO IF PEOPLE ARE 10 11 SUBMITTING EVIDENCE WHICH THEY CLAIM CONFIDENTIAL. WE RECOGNIZE THAT DILEMMA, AND WE 12 13 APPRECIATE THAT YOUR STAFF IS MAKING EVERY ATTEMPT 14 TO TRY AND ADDRESS THOSE KINDS OF CONCERNS. BUT WE ALSO FEEL THAT WHERE THE STAFF HAS CONCLUDED 15 16 THAT YOU DON'T NEED ANY MORE TECHNICAL DATA IN 17 ORDER TO MAKE THESE DETERMINATIONS, THAT WE THINK 18 THAT MIGHT ACTUALLY HELP YOU RESOLVE THIS DISPUTE. THE BOARD CERTAINLY HAS THE POWER TO RECEIVE THE 19

NECESSARY FEES FROM THE PETITIONING PARTY TO

COVER 21 THE COLLECTION OF DATA. THE OBTAINING OF THE BAGS 22 COULD UNDERGO THEIR OWN TESTING REQUIREMENTS. THE 23 PARTIES COULD AGREE WITH YOU AS TO THE PROTOCOLS 24 OF THOSE TESTS TO BE CONDUCTED, AND YOU WOULD HAVE

25 AN INDEPENDENT SOURCE OF EVIDENCE FOR

1 CONSIDERATION. 2 SO AGAIN, WE WOULD REFER YOU TO THE 3 TENNECO COMMENTS WHICH FURTHER SUPPORT MORE DATA 4 AND PERHAPS INDEPENDENT TESTING DATA UPON WHICH 5 THE BOARD COULD RELY. 6 WE'D ALSO -- WE ALSO APPRECIATE THAT 7 THE BOARD HAS THE QUESTION OVER WHAT THE IMPACTS 8 ARE TO IRONCLAD GIVEN THE DELAY. I AGREE WITH 9 COUNSEL. WE TOO HAVE RESEARCHED THIS MATTER AND CONCLUDE THAT INDEED THERE IS NO HARM TO IRONCLAD, 10 CERTAINLY NO IMMEDIATE HARM TO IRONCLAD, SHOULD 11 THIS MATTER GO ON INTO THE SPRING, AND THAT IT 12 13 DOES ALLOW THIS BOARD TO DO THIS IN AN ORDERLY FASHION AND WILL ALLOW YOU TO HAVE REGULATIONS AND 14 THEN AN ORDERLY PROCEEDING THAT PEOPLE CAN 15 16 MEANINGFULLY PARTICIPATE IN, KNOWING THE RULES, 17 KNOWING THE GUIDANCE, KNOWING THE CRITERIA. AND 18 SO WE WOULD URGE YOU TO CONTINUE WITH THAT FORMAT BECAUSE THAT WILL PRODUCE AN END RESULT THAT WILL 19 20 BE LEGALLY DEFENSIBLE AND, THEREFORE, MAKE SENSE 21 TO ALL WHO ARE INVOLVED. 22 AGAIN, FIRST BRANDS STANDS READY TO 23 CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS. WE DID HAVE SOME 24 CONCERNS WITH IRONCLAD'S REQUESTING AN OPPORTUNITY 25 TO SIT DOWN WITH STAFF AND WORK OUT NUMEROUS

- 1 MATTERS, WHATEVER THEY MAY BE. I DON'T KNOW ABOUT
- 2 IRONCLAD, BUT WE HAVE CERTAINLY EXPERIENCED THAT
- 3 THIS STAFF IS ALWAYS OPEN AND READY TO MEET WITH
- 4 FOLKS AND ENCOURAGES THAT KIND OF PARTICIPATION IN
- 5 ORDER TO RESOLVE THESE ISSUES BEFORE THEY COME TO
- 6 THIS BOARD. AND SO WE LOOK FORWARD TO PARTICI-
- 7 PATING IN ANY SUCH TECHNICAL MEETINGS WHICH MIGHT
- 8 HELP MOVE THESE TECHNICAL ISSUES FORWARD TO YOU.
- 9 THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY.
- 10 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU. ANY
- 11 QUESTIONS OF MR. RUIZ? OKAY.
- 12 NEXT WE HAVE NANCY VOS.
- MS. VOS: HI. NANCY VOS, AND I
- 14 REPRESENT -- I ACTUALLY WORK DIRECTLY FOR
- 15 POLY-AMERICA, SO FORGIVE ME IF I'M A LITTLE
- 16 NERVOUS. THIS IS SORT OF NOT MY ARENA. BUT
- 17 MOSTLY I JUST WANTED TO BRIEFLY SAY THANK YOU.

WE

- 18 BELIEVE THE REGULATIONS THAT ARE SET FORWARD ARE
- 19 VERY FAIR. WE BELIEVE THE ISSUE IS VERY SIMPLE.
- 20 YOU CAN GET TO A VERY EXTENDED TECHNOLOGICAL
- DEBATE, WHICH WE CAN, OF COURSE, GET INTO AS

WELL.

- WE BELIEVE IT'S VERY SIMPLE.
- 23 IT'S AN ISSUE WHETHER THEY COMPLY

OR

NOT. ALL THE OTHER MANUFACTURERS HAVE HAD TO COMPLY ALREADY. BY LAW THEY'VE ALREADY BEEN GIVEN

- 1 AN ADDITIONAL YEAR TO TRY TO RECONCILE THIS. THE
- 2 VAST MAJORITY OF WHAT IRONCLAD SELLS IN THE
- 3 MARKETPLACE IS UNREGULATED AND THEREFORE NOT
- 4 SUBJECT TO THIS. WE BELIEVE IT'S UNNECESSARY AS
- 5 AN EXEMPTION, AND WE BELIEVE IT'S UNFAIR TO
- 6 BUSINESS. AND WE'RE LOOKING FORWARD TO THE
- 7 HEARING. THANK YOU.
- 8 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY QUESTIONS OF
- 9 MS. VOS? THANK YOU.
- 10 MR. LIVINGSTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD I
- JUST RESPOND TO THAT LAST COMMENT?
- 12 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: SURE.
- 13 MR. LIVINGSTON: GENE LIVINGSTON AGAIN.
- 14 I WOULD JUST LIKE THE RECORD TO REFLECT THAT THE
- 15 LAST STATEMENT ABOUT THE MAJORITY OF THE BAGS THAT
- 16 IRONCLAD SELLS ARE UNREGULATED IS JUST PATENTLY
- 17 FALSE, AND MS. VOS WAS TOLD THAT LAST WEEK, THAT
- 18 THAT'S NOT ACCURATE. AND SHE HAS NO BASIS FOR
- 19 REALLY KNOWING THAT. WE'RE THE SOLE PROPRIETOR OF
- 20 OUR SALES DATA, AND I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT THAT'S
- JUST NOT AN ACCURATE STATEMENT.
- 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU.
- OKAY.
- BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: MR. CHAIRMAN, JUST
- 25 A COUPLE OF THOUGHTS, IF I COULD. FIRST OF ALL, I

- 1 THINK WE'RE FACED WITH A STATUTE THAT WAS AWKWARD 2 TO BEGIN WITH. LAWS ARE USUALLY NOT WRITTEN THIS 3 WAY IN THE MANNER THAT WOULD COVER -- IN A MANNER THAT WOULD COVER ONLY ONE SPECIFIC COMPANY. WE'RE 4 FACED WITH DEALING WITH THAT AND IT'S NOT EASY. 5 6 WE HAVE TO DO THE BEST WE CAN, BUT I THINK WE HAVE 7 TO RECOGNIZE THAT THERE STILL MAY BE A FLAW 8 SOMEWHERE IN THE PROCESS. 9 OTHER THING I WANTED TO MENTION, AND PERHAPS I'M THE LAST ONE TO EITHER COMMENT ON 10 LEGAL LANGUAGE OR SENTENCE STRUCTURE, BUT I'D LIKE 11 12 TO DO A LITTLE NIT-PICKING WITH STAFF, IF WE 13 COULD. IF YOU LOOK AT THE DRAFT REGULATIONS, GOING DOWN THE BOTTOM OF THE FIRST PAGE, AND THE 14 HEADING IS TO PETITION THE BOARD FOR A VARIANCE, 15 THE PETITIONER MUST PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR THE 16 17 REGULATED TRASH BAGS PRODUCED DURING THE PREVIOUS 18 TWELVE MONTHS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO. IN MY VIEW, ONE READS ALL RIGHT; TWO READS ALL 19 RIGHT;
- 20 THREE ALL RIGHT. WHEN YOU GET TO FOUR, THEN THE
- 21 WHOLE CONTEXT SHIFTS ON THESE QUALIFICATIONS
 AND
- 22 BEGINS IN BOTH FOUR AND FIVE TO JUMP OVER

INTO THE

- 23 AREA OF WHAT YOU MIGHT CONSIDER IN FILLING
- OUT A
- FORM AND USING THE WORD "YOU" AND WHY YOU
- BELIEVE.
- 25 AND IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THOSE DO NOT FOLLOW A

1 PROPER USE OF ENGLISH OR CONTEXT WITH THE HEADING 2 THAT STARTS THIS PARTICULAR AREA. 3 AND IF YOU DEVELOP A LIST OF INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO FILL OUT A FORM, THE LINES 5 THAT SAY YOU SHOULD DO THIS AND YOU SHOULD DO THAT 6 ARE GOOD INSTRUCTIONS, BUT TO PUT IN A REGULATION 7 THOSE WORDS, I DON'T THINK, ARE APPROPRIATE. AND PERHAPS IT'S A BIT OF NIT-PICKING, BUT I THINK IT'S SOMETHING WE OUGHT TO LOOK AT. 9 10 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. 11 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: YES. 12 13 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I BELIEVE THAT THE 14 LEGISLATURE DID GIVE US THE AUTHORITY AND NOT ONLY 15 THAT, BUT I THINK IN THE LANGUAGE INDICATED THAT 16 WE CAN AND PERHAPS SHOULD UTILIZE A BROADER

- 17 CRITERIA THAN JUST THE ONE THAT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED
- 18 BY IRONCLAD. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE STAFF HAS
- 19 ATTEMPTED TO TAKE A STEP TOWARDS GREATER FLEXI-
- 20 BILITY TO MEET SOME OF THE CONCERNS THAT HAVE BEEN
- 21 RAISED BY IRONCLAD WITH THEIR PROPOSED AMENDMENT.
- 22 AND SO MY SUGGESTION IS THAT WE ACCEPT THE STAFF'S
- 23 RECOMMENDATION AND GO OUT FOR THE TWO-WEEK
- 24 ADDITIONAL COMMENT PERIOD AND PROCEED AS HAS

BEEN

25 RECOMMENDED.

1 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I'LL SECOND. 2 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IT'S MOVED AND 3 SECONDED TO ADOPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO SUBMIT THE REGS FOR A 15-DAY PERIOD. 4 5 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WITH THE AMENDMENT 6 THAT THEY PROPOSED. 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WITH THE AMENDMENT 8 THAT THEY POSED, SO IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED. 9 ANY COMMENTS ON THE MOTION? 10 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I'D ALSO BE WILLING TO INCLUDE THE CHANGES MR. FRAZEE 11 12 SUGGESTED. 13 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: IF I COULD, JUST LIKE YOU TO HAVE A LOOK AT THE SENTENCE STRUCTURE 14 AND SEE IF THAT CAN'T BE CLEANED UP A LITTLE BIT. 15 16 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I GUESS THE 17 DIRECTION OF THE MOTION, THEN, WOULD BE TO ASK 18 STAFF TO LOOK AT THAT LANGUAGE AND, IF LEGAL 19 AGREES WITH HIS COMMENT, MAKE A TECHNICAL 20 MODIFICATION THEN. 21 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I WOULD -- I DON'T 22 KNOW THAT IT NEEDS TO BE A PART OF THE MOTION, BUT 23 I WOULD ASK THAT STAFF DO GET TOGETHER WITH THE 24 STAKEHOLDERS DURING THIS 15-DAY PERIOD AND SEE IF 25 THERE'S ANY ADJUSTMENT THAT WE OR ANY RESOLUTION

1 TO SOME OF THESE DIFFICULTIES OR QUESTIONS. 2 WE HAVE A MOTION BEFORE US. 3 SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL. 4 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WELL, LET ME ASK ABOUT THAT LAST COMMENT. I SUPPOSE -- I MEAN I'M 5 6 ALWAYS FOR CONSENSUS IF WE CAN GET THE PARTIES TO 7 AGREE, BUT WE SHOULD ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT THAT 8 COULD TRIGGER ANOTHER ADDITIONAL COMMENT PERIOD. 9 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IT COULD IF THEY 10 COME TO RESOLUTION. 11 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: SO I GUESS THE POINT WOULD BE THAT IF THERE IS SOME SORT OF 12 13 CONSENSUS THAT'S AVAILABLE THAT HASN'T BEEN THOUGHT OF THAT POPS UP, THEN IT'D BE WORTH THE 14 ADDITIONAL COMMENT PERIOD TO ACCOMMODATE A 15 CONSENSUS, I SUPPOSE. 16 17 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: WHAT WOULD BE THE 18 NATURE OF THE OUR ACTION TODAY? IF WE -- IF WE CONCUR ON THIS TODAY WITH THE MOTION AND IT GOES 19 20 TO A DISCUSSION LATER AND THERE'S SOME CHANGE, WHAT'S THE CONSEQUENCE OF THAT? 21 22 MS. TRGOVCICH: MAYBE IF I COULD JUST 23 CLARIFY. WHEN WE MOVE TO A SUBSEQUENT 15-DAY

COMMENT PERIOD, THE ELEMENTS OF THE REGULATIONS

THAT WILL BE OPEN TO COMMENT AT THAT TIME ARE THE

24

1 SPECIFIC AREAS THAT WERE PROPOSED FOR CHANGE DURING THAT 15-DAY COMMENT PERIOD. SO THE AREAS 2 3 THAT WILL BE UNDER DISCUSSION, THAT WILL BE OPEN 4 FOR DISCUSSION WILL BE THE SPECIFIC CHANGES THAT 5 YOU ARE APPROVING TODAY AND NOT ANY OTHER ELEMENT 6 OF THE REGULATORY PACKAGE. 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: TRUE, BUT THEY COULD COME BACK TO US. IF THEY FIND THAT THERE IS 8 SOME COMMON GROUND WITHIN THAT 15-DAY PERIOD, THEY 9 10 COULD COME BACK AND ASK US TO RELOOK AT CERTAIN 11 ISSUES. 12 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WE'RE NOT CONFINED, I GUESS --13 14 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: RIGHT. RIGHT. AND 15 ALL I'M SAYING IS I'D LIKE FOR THEM TO ENSURE THAT THEY DO THAT. I HAVEN'T EVEN PUT IT AS PART OF 16 17 THE MOTION. SO IF THEY SEE IN THE NEXT 15 DAYS THAT THEY ARE ABLE TO WORK OUT SOME OF THESE 18 19 ISSUES, THEN THEY CAN BRING IT BACK AND WE'LL DEAL 20 WITH IT AT THAT POINT. I THINK THE POLICY 21 COMMITTEE MEETS IN THE NEXT 15 DAYS, BUT ANYWAY. 22 OKAY. WE HAVE A MOTION. IT WAS SECONDED. ARE 23 YOU CLEAR ON THE MOTION?

THE SECRETARY: IS IT OPTION 3 WITH

24

25

THE --

1 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: LET ME MAKE SURE I 2 KNOW WHAT OPTION 3 IS. WHAT PAGE ARE WE TALKING 3 ABOUT? 4 THE SECRETARY: 85. 5 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: OKAY. 6 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY? 7 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: OPTION 3 WITH THE 8 SPECIFICATION OF WHAT THAT CHANGE IS AND MR. 9 FRAZEE'S ISSUE. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WE HAVE A MOTION 10 AND IT'S BEEN SECONDED. WILL THE SECRETARY CALL 11 THE ROLL, PLEASE. 12 13 BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO. 14 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE. BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE. 15 16 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE. 17 BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH. 18 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE. 19 BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS. 20 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE. 21 BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON. 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. MOVING ON TO ITEM 29, CONSIDERATION 23 24 OF CONFIDENTIALITY DETERMINATION WITH REGARD TO 25 PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FOR PLASTIC TRASH BAGS

1 ANNUAL CERTIFICATION AND CONSIDERATION OF 2 POSTPONEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY DETERMINATION 3 REGARDING PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FOR PLASTIC TRASH BAG VARIANCE DOCUMENTATION. 4 MS. TRGOVCICH: THANK YOU. THAT WAS 5 6 EXCELLENTLY STATED. 7 THE MOTION COMING OUT OF COMMITTEE 8 ON THIS PARTICULAR ITEM PERTAINED, AS WE DESCRIBED 9 IN THE LAST ITEM, SPECIFICALLY TO THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST REGARDING PRIOR YEAR 10 CERTIFICATIONS. THE CERTIFICATIONS WERE FOR 11 CALENDAR YEARS '93, '94, AND '95. THE COMMITTEE 12 13 MOVED TO ADOPT THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION. 14 WE HAVE TWO ITEMS TO BRING FORWARD FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION AT THIS TIME. THE FIRST IS 15 16 THAT IN THE INTERVENING TIME PERIOD BETWEEN THE 17 COMMITTEE MEETING AND THE BOARD MEETING, WE HAVE 18 CONTINUED TO REVIEW, BECAUSE THIS IS SUCH AN IMPORTANT, SENSITIVE AREA, THE FORMS, THE 19 20 CERTIFICATES, AND THE CONFIDENTIAL ASPECT OF THEM. 21 AND WE HAVE IDENTIFIED AN ADDITIONAL AREA THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO INCLUDE AS AN ITEM TO PROTECT UNDER 22 23 THE MOTION THAT CAME OUT OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING 24 THIS MONTH. SO THAT'S THE FIRST ADDITIONAL ITEM

THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO COVER.

1 STAFF WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST THAT THE 2 BOARD MODIFY THAT MOTION TO INCLUDE TWO ADDITIONAL 3 AREAS, WHICH JERRY WILL DESCRIBE FOR YOU IN A 4 MOMENT. 5 THE SECOND AREA IS THAT WE RECEIVED 6 A REVISED PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST. THE PUBLIC 7 RECORDS REQUEST, AS YOU REMEMBER, IS WHAT 8 PRECIPITATED THIS ITEM COMING BEFORE YOU AND FOR A 9 BOARD DETERMINATION AROUND THE CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF THE INFORMATION BEING REQUESTED. WE RECEIVED A 10 REVISED PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST. A COPY WAS 11 DELIVERED TO YOUR OFFICES, I BELIEVE, ON MONDAY OF 12 13 THIS WEEK. WE RECEIVED IT ON FRIDAY. AND WE WILL BE PRESENTING INFORMATION AND STAFF RECOMMENDATION 14 15 AROUND THAT REQUEST AS WELL. MR. HART: MR. CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, 16 17 JERRY HART. WE'RE TODAY HERE TO CONSIDER THE 18 MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ADOPTION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION PURSUANT TO THE CONFIDENTIALITY 19 20 ISSUE OF A PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST FOR '93, '94, 21 AND '95 CALENDAR YEAR MANUFACTURER'S 22 CERTIFICATIONS SUBMITTED BY IRONCLAD. 23 AT THE NOVEMBER 7TH MARKET 24 DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING, COMMITTEE ADOPTED 25 STAFF RECOMMENDATION THAT WE PROTECT PARTICULAR

1 SECTIONS OF THOSE ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS WHICH, IN ESSENCE, PROTECTED SALES DATA, CUSTOMER AND CLIENT 2 3 LISTS. THIS TYPE OF INFORMATION IS SPECIFICALLY 4 LISTED AS INFORMATION THAT THE BOARD SHOULD 5 CONSIDER CONFIDENTIAL AND TREAT AS SUCH IN THE б BOARD'S REGULATIONS ON CONFIDENTIALITY. 7 THE INDICATION WAS BROUGHT TO MY ATTENTION THAT I MISSED A COUPLE SECTIONS OF THOSE 8 CERTIFICATIONS. THOSE CERTIFICATIONS -- OTHER 9 10 SECTION OF THE CERTIFICATIONS CONTAIN THAT SAME 11 INFORMATION OF CUSTOMER AND CLIENT LISTS, SO THE 12 REVISION IN THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION THAT WE WOULD LIKE THE BOARD TO CONSIDER NOW READS AS FOLLOWS: 13 14 NO. 1 OF THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION 15 REMAINS THE SAME. THE SALES DATA IN SECTION B WITH THE EXCEPTION OF LINES 25, 16, 25 OF THE '93 16 CERTIFICATION AND LINE 16 OF THE '94 AND '95 17 CERTIFICATIONS, WHICH IS THE ACTUAL PERCENTAGE OF 18 RECYCLED POSTCONSUMER MATERIAL USED BY THE 19 20 MANUFACTURER. WE MAINTAIN THAT THE PERCENTAGE 21 FIGURES ARE NOT CONFIDENTIAL AND, THEREFORE, 22 SHOULD BE RELEASED. 23 THE FIRST CHANGE OCCURS IN STAFF RECOMMENDATION ITEM 2. WE'RE ON PAGE 94, I 24

SHOULD

LIST CONTAINED IN SECTIONS C AND YOU'RE PROPOSING

1

25

ADDING SECTION D OF IRONCLAD'S 1993 TRASH BAG 2 3 MANUFACTURER'S CERTIFICATION. IF YOU WOULD TURN 4 TO PAGE 102 OF THE PACKET, 1993 TRASH BAG 5 MANUFACTURER'S CERTIFICATION, SECTION C IS THE б CUSTOMER INFORMATION, THE CUSTOMERS OF THE 7 REGULATED TRASH BAGS, CLEARLY CUSTOMER LIST. 8 SECTION D, WHICH I MISSED PREVIOUSLY, IS IDENTIFICATION OF CUSTOMERS OF ANY POSTCONSUMER 9 10 MATERIAL THAT THE MANUFACTURER MAY HAVE PRODUCED 11 AND SOLD, CLEARLY A CLIENT LIST. 12 THE OTHER REVISION IN THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF NO. 3 IS THE RPPCM SUPPLIER LIST 13 14 CONTAINED IN SECTIONS E. STAFF PROPOSES TO ALSO 15 ADD SECTION F OF IRONCLAD'S '94 CERTIFICATION AND 16 SECTION F OF IRONCLAD'S '95 CERTIFICATION. 17 SO WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING TO DO IS PROTECT BOTH SECTIONS E AND F OF THE '94 AND '95. 18 19 IF YOU WILL TURN TO PAGE 107 OF THE 20 PACKET AND THE ATTACHMENTS OF THE '94 21 CERTIFICATION, AGAIN SECTION E IS THE CUSTOMERS TO 22 WHOM THE MANUFACTURER MAY HAVE SOLD RESIN IF THEY 23 PRODUCED RESIN. SECTION F IS THE SUPPLIERS OF 2.4 RESIN TO THAT BAG MANUFACTURER. AGAIN, WE THINK

PRETTY CLEARLY CUSTOMER CLIENT LISTS. THOSE

1 SECTIONS E AND F ARE THE SAME IN THE '95 2 CERTIFICATION. 3 SO IN SUMMARY, WE'RE PROPOSING TO 4 ADD SECTION D TO BE PROTECTED, THE '93 BAG 5 MANUFACTURER'S CERTIFICATION, WHICH CONTAINS 6 CUSTOMER LISTS, AND SECTION -- ADDING SECTION F 7 TO -- ADDING SECTION F TO THE '94 CERTIFICATION 8 AND SECTION E TO THE '95 CERTIFICATION. AGAIN, 9 CLIENT LISTS. 10 I APOLOGIZE FOR THE OVERSIGHT AND 11 HOPE THAT YOU WILL FIND THIS IN CONCERT WITH THE 12 BOARD'S REGULATIONS ON CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, CUSTOMER AND CLIENT LISTS. 13 14 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: QUESTION. GOING 15 BACK TO THE ANSWER TO MY EARLIER QUESTION OF WHY THIS WASN'T TAKEN CARE OF IN THE REGULATIONS, AND 16 17 THE EXPLANATION THAT THIS COVERS NOT THAT SUBJECT 18 BUT THE WHOLE CERTIFICATION, IF I'M FOLLOWING 19 CORRECTLY, THESE FORMS ARE FILLED OUT BY EVERY 20 PLASTIC BAG MANUFACTURER. THEN SHOULD WE NOT BE 21 PROTECTING THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF EVERY 22 MANUFACTURER AND NOT JUST IRONCLAD? IF THAT'S THE 23 CASE, THEN WHY DO WE NEED TO ASK THE QUESTIONS ON 24 THE FORM IN THE FIRST PLACE?

MR. HART: I BELIEVE THAT WE'RE

1 RESPONDING TO A PARTICULAR PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST 2 FOR THIS PARTICULAR INFORMATION. 3 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: TO ME THAT'S NOT GOOD POLICY. THE POLICY OUGHT TO APPLY TO 4 EVERYONE AND NOT TO A SINGLE COMPANY. 5 6 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. FRAZEE, MAYBE TO HELP 7 ME UNDERSTAND YOUR POINT, IS WHAT YOU ARE ASKING IS THAT IF THIS INFORMATION, AND JUST -- JERRY 8 9 JUST SUMMARIZED IT FOR YOU, SECTIONS C AND D OF THE '93, E AND F OF THE '94 AND '95 SHOULD BE 10 PROTECTED FOR ALL MANUFACTURERS. IS THE QUESTION 11 YOU'RE ASKING WHY WE'RE ASKING FOR IT AT ALL IN 12 13 THE FORMS? 14 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: YEAH. WELL, OR 15 THIS SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION DEALS ONLY WITH PROTECTING IRONCLAD'S INFORMATION. SO WE'RE PUT 16 17 IN A POSITION, I BELIEVE, UNLESS I'M NOT 18 UNDERSTANDING THIS, THAT WE'RE SAYING WE'RE GOING TO PROTECT IRONCLAD'S CUSTOMER LIST AND SUPPLIERS 19 20 LIST, BUT WE'RE NOT GOING TO PROTECT OTHER 21 MANUFACTURERS. 22 MS. TRGOVCICH: I BELIEVE THAT, AS JERRY 23 STATED, WE ARE RESPONDING TO A SPECIFIC PUBLIC

RECORDS ACT REQUEST, BUT WE WOULD VIEW THIS AS A

PRECEDENT FOR ANY OTHER REQUESTS THAT WOULD BE

24

1 MADE OF THE BOARD. 2 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: MY POINT IS THAT I 3 DON'T THINK THAT'S GOOD POLICY JUST TO ADOPT OUR POLICY BASED ON A REQUEST RATHER THAN ON THE 4 5 GENERAL BROAD SUBJECT WHETHER IT'S APPROPRIATE TO 6 DISCLOSE CONFIDENTIAL AND PROPRIETARY INFORMATION. 7 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AS I UNDERSTAND IT, 8 LET ME JUST SEE IF MAYBE I'M CONFUSED TOO. ALL 9 THE MANUFACTURERS ARE REQUIRED TO FILL OUT THE FORMS. THE FORMS ARE CONFIDENTIAL SUBJECT TO A 10 REQUEST. WHAT WE'VE RECEIVED IS A REQUEST. SO 11 12 NOW WE'RE TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO HANDLE THAT 13 REQUEST. BY HANDLING THIS ONE, THIS WOULD BE PRECEDENT MAKING, PRESUMABLY, FOR OTHER REQUESTS 14 15 SHOULD THEY BE RECEIVED. IS THAT A CORRECT 16 UNDERSTANDING? 17 MR. HART: I BELIEVE THAT'S A CORRECT 18 UNDERSTANDING. BOARD MEMBER RELIS: SO IT ISN'T THAT 19 20 WE'RE MAKING AN EXCEPTION FOR IRONCLAD BECAUSE ALL 21 PARTIES ARE FOLLOWING THIS. IT'S JUST THAT WE 22 HAVEN'T HAD A REQUEST. 23 MS. TOBIAS: CAN I POINT OUT IN YOUR PACKET ON PAGE 95, SECTION 17042 DOES POINT OUT --24

DOES KIND OF DISCUSS WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE TODAY

IF I'M CLEAR ON WHERE WE'RE GOING. IT BASICALLY

```
SAYS REQUESTS FOR RECORDS WHICH ARE NOT EXEMPT
 2
 3
      FROM DISCLOSURE BY STATE OR FEDERAL LAW AND WHICH
      ARE DETERMINED IN THIS ARTICLE TO BE CONFIDENTIAL,
 4
      PROPRIETARY SHALL BE EVALUATED TO DETERMINE
 5
 6
      WHETHER ON THE FACTS OF THE PARTICULAR CASE...
 7
               BOARD MEMBER RELIS: THAT'S WHERE WE'RE
 8
      AT, FACTS OF A PARTICULAR CASE.
 9
               MS. TOBIAS: I THINK THAT MS. TRGOVCICH
      WAS CORRECT IN SAYING THAT THIS WOULD ACT AS A
10
      PRECEDENT. YOU KNOW, A PRECEDENT IS SIMPLY THAT.
11
      DOESN'T MEAN THAT YOU CAN'T DEVIATE THE NEXT TIME
12
13
      IF THERE'S SOMETHING ELSE IN THAT PARTICULAR
      SITUATION WHICH IS DIFFERENT. BUT AT THIS POINT
14
      WE'RE RESPONDING TO SECTION 17042, WHICH STATES
15
      THAT WE WILL DO IT ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS.
16
17
               BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: IF I WERE
18
      REPRESENTING IRONCLAD AND THERE WAS THIS REQUEST
19
      TO SEE THIS, I THINK MY FIRST REACTION WOULD BE,
20
       "OKAY. I'M GOING TO FILE A PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST
21
      TO SEE EVERYONE ELSE'S INFORMATION. IF IT'S
22
      APPROPRIATE TO RELEASE MINE, THEN LET'S RELEASE
23
      EVERYONE'S, " AND WE'D BE TO GROUND ZERO, AND WE
24
      WE'D BE IN A POSITION OF LOOKING AT THIS POLICY AS
25
      IT REGARDS EVERY OTHER MANUFACTURER.
```

1 MS. TOBIAS: WELL, I THINK CARRIED OUT TO 2 THAT EXTREME, THAT'S PROBABLY TRUE. WHAT I'M 3 GOING FROM IS WHAT OUR REGS DO STATE, WHICH I THINK WERE SET UP TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC RECORD 4 5 REQUESTS WHEN WE HAVE THAT INFORMATION. 6 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I'LL ACCEPT THAT, 7 BUT I THINK IT'S A SUBJECT AREA, THAT MY EARLIER 8 STATEMENT, IF WE'RE GOING TO KEEP THIS INFORMATION 9 CONFIDENTIAL, YOU KNOW, WE NEED TO LOOK AT WHY WE NEED TO ASK THOSE QUESTIONS TO BEGIN WITH, IF 10 11 THEY'RE REALLY USEFUL IN EVALUATING SOMETHING, ONE 12 THING OR ANOTHER. 13 MS. TOBIAS: I'LL ALSO POINT OUT THAT THIS IS BASED ON THE STATUTORY SCHEME IN THIS TOO, 14 SO IT MAY BE BRINGING OUT A POINT THAT TRACKS ALL 15 16 THE WAY BACK TO A STATUTE AND MAYBE NEEDS TO BE 17 HANDLED LEGISLATIVELY. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. LET'S SEE. 18 MR. HART: EXCUSE ME, MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D 19 20 LIKE TO ADDRESS THE SECOND POINT THAT CAREN 21 BROUGHT UP REGARDING A REVISED PUBLIC RECORDS 22 REQUEST BY HUNTER RUIZ. AT THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT 23 COMMITTEE MEETING, WE WERE CONSIDERING A REQUEST 24 FOR THE ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS. THEREFORE, WE HAD

THIS RECOMMENDATION BY STAFF. AND AT THAT TIME

WE

1 WERE NOTIFIED THAT WE WOULD THEN BE LOOKING AT A 2 REVISED REQUEST FOR INFORMATION. 3 WE'VE RECEIVED THAT LETTER THAT CAREN REFERRED TO THAT WAS RECEIVED ON FRIDAY AND 4 5 PERHAPS YOU RECEIVED COPIES OF MONDAY. I THINK 6 PERHAPS WE WOULD GO THROUGH THE INFORMATION 7 THEY'RE REQUESTING AND GIVE OUR STAFF 8 RECOMMENDATION ON HOW TO RESPOND TO THAT REQUEST. 9 THE LETTER FROM HUNTER RUIZ REQUESTS -- THE AMENDED REQUEST, PUBLIC RECORDS 10 11 REQUEST, RENEWS THEIR REQUEST FOR A COPY OF ANY 12 AND ALL CERTIFICATIONS OF NONCOMPLIANCE. WE DON'T 13 THINK THAT THAT'S A PROBLEM. CERTIFICATIONS OF NONCOMPLIANCE FILED BY IRONCLAD. WE DON'T THINK 14 THAT THAT'S A PROBLEM. 15 THE SECOND ITEM HUNTER RUIZ REOUESTS 16 17 IS ALL COPIES OF THE ANNUAL CERTIFICATIONS FILED 18 CONSISTENT WITH THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS OF CONFIDENTIALITY AS OF NOVEMBER 7TH. 19 20 WE PROBABLY SHOULD ASK HUNTER RUIZ, DARLENE RUIZ, 21 TO COME UP AND SEE IF THEIR REQUEST FOR THIS INFORMATION NOW WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH OUR 22 23 REVISED STAFF RECOMMENDATION. 24 FINALLY, THE THIRD ITEM THAT THEY

REQUEST ARE THE NUMBER OF SUPPLIERS, THE STATE IN

1 WHICH A SUPPLIER IS LOCATED, AND A DESCRIPTION OF 2 THE APPROXIMATE PRIOR USAGE OF THE PLASTIC 3 POSTCONSUMER MATERIAL, WHICH IS A STATUTORY REQUIREMENT THAT MANUFACTURERS PROVIDE TO US ON 4 5 THE CERTIFICATIONS. 6 STAFF FEELS THAT THIS LAST REQUEST, 7 NUMBER OF SUPPLIERS, THE STATE, AND THE 8 IDENTIFICATION OF THE APPROXIMATE PRIOR USAGE, 9 WHAT THE POSTCONSUMER RESIN WAS MADE OUT OF, MILK JUGS OR CLEANING BAGS OR STRETCH WRAP, WHATEVER, 10 FALLS INTO THE CATEGORY OF SUPPLIER INFORMATION. 11 12 OUR FEELING IS THAT WE'VE DECIDED, BASED ON THE BOARD'S REGULATIONS, THAT SUPPLIER INFORMATION IS 13 CONFIDENTIAL AND SHOULD BE TREATED AS SUCH. 14 THEREFORE, WE FEEL THAT THIS THIRD 15 REQUEST IS ASKING FOR, IN ESSENCE, SUPPLIER 16 17 INFORMATION, ALBEIT NONSPECIFIC. HOWEVER, WE FEEL 18 THAT WITH BITS AND PIECES OF THE PICTURE, OF THE SUPPLIER PICTURE OF A PARTICULAR MANUFACTURER 19 20 GATHERED FROM OTHER SOURCES AND A BIT AND A PIECE 21 HERE AND THERE REQUESTED FROM THE ANNUAL 22 CERTIFICATIONS, A COMPETITOR COULD CREATE A FAIRLY 23 REASONABLE PICTURE OF THE SUPPLIES OF RESIN TO 24 THAT MANUFACTURER. THEREFORE, STAFF FEELS THAT

THIS INFORMATION SHOULD BE PROTECTED AS

1 CONFIDENTIAL AND NOT BE RELEASED. 2 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. 3 QUESTIONS OF THE STAFF? NEXT WE HAVE DARLENE RUIZ AGAIN. 4 MS. RUIZ: GOOD MORNING AGAIN. JUST LIKE 5 6 THE RECORD TO REFLECT THAT I THINK IN THE STAFF'S 7 INTRODUCTION THEY DID DESCRIBE THIS AS A REQUEST 8 FROM IRONCLAD. THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST WAS 9 MADE BY HUNTER RUIZ ON BEHALF OF FIRST BRANDS. AND IT'S IMPORTANT TO ALSO NOTE THAT FIRST BRANDS 10 11 ALSO FILES THESE CERTIFICATIONS, AND SO WE ARE 12 VERY SENSITIVE TO THOSE PORTIONS WHICH SHOULD BE 13 PROTECTED IN ORDER TO PREVENT ANTICOMPETITIVE USE OF THAT INFORMATION, BUT WE HAVE MODIFIED OUR 14 15 REQUEST. BY THE WAY, IN RESPONSE TO THE 16 17 STAFF'S OVERALL RECOMMENDATION TO INCLUDE 18 DIFFERENT SECTIONS AS IDENTIFIED, WE HAVE NO VARIANCE WITH THAT. WE THINK IT'S CONSISTENT WITH 19 20 THE STAFF'S ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION AT THE MARKET 21 DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. THEY'RE JUST MAKING MORE 22 SPECIFIC THEIR PROTECTION OF SUPPLIER AND CUSTOMER 23 LISTS, SO WE HAVE NO DIFFICULTY WITH THAT. 24 WHAT WE ARE SEEKING HERE AND URGE

THE BOARD TO PROVIDE US IS THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO

1 HAVE KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING WHERE THESE PCR MANUFACTURERS, WHETHER THEY'RE IN CALIFORNIA OR 2 3 OUT OF CALIFORNIA. CAN WE ISOLATE WHO THEY ARE BY 4 VIRTUE OF THAT? WE DON'T BELIEVE THAT YOU CAN. 5 WE TRIED TO LOOK AT OUR OWN LIST, OUR OWN б CERTIFICATIONS, AND CONCLUDED THAT YOU CANNOT GO 7 BACK JUST BY VIRTUE OF GIVING US THE STATE THAT 8 HAS BEEN REPORTED AND THE NUMBERS OF SUPPLIERS THAT THEY REPORTED, THAT YOU CAN GO BACK AND 9 10 IDENTIFY WHO THEY ARE WITH ANY CERTAINTY 11 WHATSOEVER. YOU MAY SPECULATE CERTAINLY, BUT YOU 12 COULD NOT IDENTIFY, BASED ON OUR INFORMATION, WHO THEY ARE SO THAT IT COULD BE USED IN SOME 13 14 ANTICOMPETITIVE FASHION. 15 BY THE WAY, THAT IS NOT THE PURPOSE OF OUR REQUEST. WE ARE ATTEMPTING TO DO SOME 16 17 LEGITIMATE RESEARCH IN THIS MATTER THAT GOES TO BIGGER PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES, AND WE BELIEVE THAT 18 THE BOARD'S OBLIGATION IS TO WEIGH THE PROTECTIONS 19 20 OF THE PUBLIC RECORD ACT REQUEST PROVISIONS, 21 GIVING PUBLIC ACCESS TO REASONABLE INFORMATION 22 AGAINST THE COMPETING VALUES OF CONFIDENTIALITY 23 AND TRADE SECRETS. 2.4 AND HERE WHERE WE'RE SIMPLY ASKING

FOR VERY NARROW INFORMATION ON THE STATE AND THE

1 PREVIOUS USE OF THE PCR, WE DON'T BELIEVE YOU CAN GO BACK AND IN ANY WAY VIOLATE SOMEONE'S TRADE 2 3 SECRETS OR CUSTOMER LISTS OR SUPPLIER LISTS, AND 4 THAT IS NOT THE PURPOSE. IF IT WERE ABLE TO BE 5 DONE, IT WOULD CERTAINLY BE DONE TO US AS WELL, б AND SO WE WOULD NOT BE SEEKING SOMETHING THAT WE 7 WOULD SUSPICION SOME OTHER COMPETITOR MIGHT WANT TO COME BACK AND TRY AND RECONSTRUCT. WE DON'T 8 THINK THAT'S POSSIBLE. 9 10 AGAIN, WE URGE THAT IN YOUR WEIGHING 11 OF THE NEED FOR THE PUBLIC TO KNOW, THAT YOU 12 PROVIDE US THIS VERY LIMITED INFORMATION AND THAT WE OTHERWISE SUPPORT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION, 13 14 SEEKING TO IDENTIFY VERY SPECIFICALLY THOSE 15 PORTIONS OF THE FORM WHICH ARE TO BE PROTECTED. 16 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. ANY 17 QUESTIONS? 18 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: NOW, WE'VE HEARD 19 STAFF'S EXPLANATION AND NOW WE'VE HEARD THE 20 ASSERTION THAT YOU CAN'T REALLY PUT THE PIECES 21 TOGETHER TO CREATE AN UNDERSTANDING. I'D JUST BE 22 INTERESTED IF STAFF HAD ANY FURTHER RESPONSE TO 23 WHAT MS. RUIZ IS SUGGESTING HERE. 2.4 MR. HART: WELL, I THINK IT DEPENDS UPON

THE PARTICULAR INFORMATION THAT IS PARTICULAR TO

EACH COMPANY. IF A LARGER COMPANY, THAT

1

25

INFORMATION WAS PROVIDED REGARDING A LARGER 2 3 COMPANY, IT WOULD BE FAR MORE DIFFICULT TO CREATE 4 A PICTURE. ASSUMING THAT THAT LARGER COMPANY 5 WOULD HAVE MULTIPLE FACILITIES AROUND THE COUNTRY, б THEY WOULD HAVE MANY MORE SUPPLIERS OF RESIN. THE 7 STATES MIGHT BE SPREAD OUT ALL OVER THE PLACE. 8 MAYBE A COUPLE, ONE PERHAPS FROM EACH STATE. THEREFORE, YEAH, IT WOULD BE PRETTY DIFFICULT TO 9 10 PUT TOGETHER ANY PARTICULAR, YOU KNOW, FEELING FOR 11 WHAT THEY WERE DOING AND WHO THEIR SPECIFIC SUPPLIERS WERE. NOT TERRIBLY DIFFICULT, I WOULD 12 HAVE TO ADD, BUT CERTAINLY MORE DIFFICULT. 13 14 ON THE OTHER HAND, FOR THE SMALLEST 15 MANUFACTURERS WHO MAY AND CERTAINLY DO HAVE VERY 16 FEW NUMBERS OF SUPPLIERS, ONE, TWO, THREE, AND THEY MAY ALL RESIDE IN ONE PARTICULAR STATE, I 17 WOULD HAZARD THAT A VERY CLEAR DESCRIPTION OF 18 WHERE THEY WERE GETTING THEIR MATERIAL AND THOSE 19 20 COMPANY NAMES COULD BE PUT TOGETHER. I THINK IT 21 KIND OF DEPENDS ON THE PARTICULAR COMPANY. 22 BUT I REALLY DO THINK THAT THAT 23 INFORMATION IS POTENTIALLY VERY SENSITIVE. AND, 24 AGAIN, BY GATHERING A BIT OF INFORMATION HERE AND

THERE AND USING A STATE MANDATED CERTIFICATION

- 1 PROGRAM TO PICK OUT A FEW MORE PIECES OF
- 2 INFORMATION, THAT COULD PROVIDE A VERY HARMFUL
- 3 PICTURE TO COMPETITORS.
- 4 MS. RUIZ: IF I MAY, JUST ON THE ONE
- 5 POINT, IF IT WERE A SMALLER ONE AS IN THE EXAMPLE
- 6 CITED AND THERE WERE ONLY THREE OR FOUR WITHIN THE
- 7 SAME STATE, I THINK IT WOULD EVEN BECOME MORE
- 8 DIFFICULT, ASSUMING THERE WERE MORE THAN THREE OR
- 9 FOUR SUPPLIERS IN THAT STATE. WE WOULDN'T BE ABLE
- 10 TO IDENTIFY THOSE SUPPLIERS SPECIFICALLY. AND I
- 11 THINK THAT WHATEVER INFORMATION WE MAY BE ABLE TO
- 12 OBTAIN ELSEWHERE, THAT AGAIN IS NOT THE PURPOSE OF
- 13 THE SEARCH, AND IT IS NOT IN ANY WAY THAT WE'VE
- 14 BEEN ABLE TO DETERMINE, MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD YOU
- 15 IDENTIFY IT FROM OUR LIST, SO WE'RE SUPPOSING THAT
- 16 WE CAN'T IDENTIFY IT FROM OTHERS AND HAVE FOUND NO
- 17 BASIS FOR THAT.
- 18 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. ANY OTHER
- 19 QUESTIONS?
- BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: IF I COULD, MS.
- 21 RUIZ. THE PURPOSE FOR YOUR REQUEST IS SOLELY TO
- 22 DETERMINE COMPLIANCE BY A COMPETITOR?
- MS. RUIZ: NO, NOT NECESSARILY. THAT --
- 24 WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO LOOK TO IS THE IN- AND
- 25 OUT-OF-STATE NATURE OF THE PCR MARKET. AND THAT

- 1 YOUR CERTIFICATIONS PROVIDE US WHETHER OR NOT THAT 2 PCR IS BEING GENERATED HERE IN CALIFORNIA OR SOLD 3 HERE IN CALIFORNIA ACTUALLY OR IS COMING FROM OUT 4 OF STATE. 5 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: BUT DOESN'T THAT 6 HAVE TO DO WITH COMPLIANCE VERSUS THE COMPETITIVE 7 EDGE? 8 MS. RUIZ: YES, IT DOES, BUT ONLY TO THE 9 DEGREE THAT IT'S AN INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THOSE BROAD PARAGRAPH FORMS IDENTIFIED BY STAFF, THAT 10 11 THE SUPPLIER LISTS THE STATE IN THEIR ADDRESS AS 12 TO WHERE IT IS COMING FROM. THEY LIST AN ENTIRE 13 ADDRESS AND THE NAME OF A PERSON OR AN INDIVIDUAL 14 AND THEN THEY LIST THE STATE. BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: IF YOUR REQUESTS 15 WERE HONORED AND WE WERE NOT GOING THROUGH THIS 16 17 EXERCISE RIGHT NOW AND YOU OBTAINED THAT 18 INFORMATION, THE RESULT OF OBTAINING THAT INFORMATION WOULD BE TO SAY, "AHA. THEY DIDN'T 19 20 COMPLY." 21 MS. RUIZ: NO. THAT ISN'T THE PURPOSE.
- 23 IT'S FOR A COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE.

22

OR

MS. RUIZ: NO, NOT NECESSARILY.

BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: IT'S EITHER THAT

WHETHER

THEY'RE IN COMPLIANCE OR NOT, I COULD NOT

- 1 ASCERTAIN SHORT OF THEIR DECLARATION OR 2 CERTIFICATION THAT THEY WERE IN COMPLIANCE. AND

THAT PART, I BELIEVE, THEY CONCEDED WE CAN GET.

THE ANTICOMPETITIVE NATURE, I HAVE

- 5 TO HAVE VOLUMES AND NAMES, IDENTIFICATION OF THE
- 6 ACTUAL SUPPLIERS OR BE ABLE TO TRACE BACK TO THOSE
- 7 VOLUMES AND THE NAMES BY VIRTUE OF THE INFORMATION
- 8 I'M REQUESTING. WE ARE NOT ASKING FOR THAT. WE
- 9 ARE ONLY TRYING TO IDENTIFY THE STATE, WHETHER
- 10 IT'S IN CALIFORNIA OR OUT OF CALIFORNIA.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: JUST FOLLOWING UP ON
- 12 WHAT MR. FRAZEE SAID, YOU'RE NOT ENGAGED IN BASIC
- 13 RESEARCH. YOU'RE INVOLVED WITH RESEARCH FOR A
- 14 PURPOSE, RIGHT?

3

- 15 MS. RUIZ: WELL, THE RESEARCH GOES TO A
- 16 BIGGER PUBLIC POLICY ISSUE. IT DOESN'T
- 17 NECESSARILY ADDRESS JUST IRONCLAD. RIGHT NOW, AS
- 18 ADEQUATELY STATED BY COUNSEL, THIS SETS A
- 19 PRECEDENT.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AND WHAT'S THE
- 21 PRECEDENT AGAIN?
- 22 MS. RUIZ: WELL, WHETHER OR NOT WE CAN
- OBTAIN WHETHER THE PCR SOURCE IS IN STATE OR OUT
- 24 OF STATE.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AND ONCE YOU LEARN

1 THAT, WHAT DOES THAT DO FOR YOU? I GUESS THAT'S WHERE I'M HAVING A PROBLEM. 2 3 MS. RUIZ: WE'RE ATTEMPTING TO DETERMINE 4 HOW MUCH OF IT IS ACTUALLY COMING AND MEETING THE 5 STATE POLICIES FOR PUBLIC DIVERSION IN CALIFORNIA 6 AND SUPPORT OF CALIFORNIA --7 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: SO THAT'S THE 8 COMPLIANCE SIDE OF IT THAT I SUGGESTED. 9 MS. RUIZ: NO. IT GOES TO EVEN BROADER 10 ISSUES TIED TO LEGISLATION LAST YEAR AND POTENTIAL 11 LEGISLATION IN THE FUTURE. 12 MS. TOBIAS: MR. CHAIR, FOR PURPOSES OF -- MR. PENNINGTON, FOR PURPOSES OF THE RECORD, 13 14 SINCE YOU ARE TRYING TO DETERMINE ON A CASE-BY-15 CASE BASIS, YOU MAY WANT TO HAVE IRONCLAD PUT 16 THEIR INTEREST ON THE RECORD AS WELL SINCE WHAT 17 YOU'RE DOING HERE AGAIN IS BALANCING WHAT THE HARM AND WHAT THE BENEFIT IS IN TERMS OF RELEASING 18 THAT 19 INFORMATION. 20 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THAT WAS -- MY NEXT

SPEAKER IS GENE LIVINGSTON WITH IRONCLAD.

MR. LIVINGSTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS

21

OF

THE BOARD, MY NAME IS GENE LIVINGSTON

REPRESENTING

- 24 IRONCLAD. FIRST, WITH RESPECT TO THE STAFF'S 25 RECOMMENDATION ON THE EARLIER PUBLIC RECORDS ACT

1 REQUEST, WE SUPPORT THAT RECOMMENDATION AND 2 APPRECIATE THE STAFF'S BRINGING TO YOUR ATTENTION 3 THE CLARIFICATION AND THE ADDITION OF THOSE ADDITIONAL SUBSECTIONS OF THE COMPLIANCE FORM. 4 5 AND SO WE'D URGE YOU TO APPROVE THAT PORTION OF 6 THE MOTION. 7 WITH RESPECT TO THIS SO-CALLED 8 AMENDED REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RECORDS ACT, IT SEEMS 9 TO ME TWO THINGS ABOUT THAT. I DON'T THINK 10 THERE'S ANY SUCH THING AS AN AMENDED PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST. THIS IS ESSENTIALLY A NEW 11 12 REQUEST. I THINK WE'VE GOT TO GO BACK AT THE 13 BEGINNING AND START ALL OVER, AND YOU HAVE A 14 REGULATION THAT SETS OUT A PROCESS FOR THAT. AND THIS DOCUMENT WAS GIVEN TO US 15 16 LAST NIGHT. IT'S THE FIRST TIME WE'VE SEEN IT AND 17 REALLY HAVE HAD NO OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK AT WHAT'S INVOLVED, PARTICULARLY WITH RESPECT TO THE FIRST 18 19 ISSUE. 20 WITH RESPECT TO THE PARTS OF THIS 21 REQUEST THAT ARE THE SAME AS WHAT YOU ALREADY HAVE 22 BEFORE YOU, I HAVE NO TROUBLE WITH YOU MAKING A 23 DECISION ON THAT. BUT TO THE EXTENT THAT IT

24 REQUESTS NEW INFORMATION, DIFFERENT KIND OF 25 INFORMATION, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE OUGHT TO START

1 AT THE BEGINNING AND GO THROUGH THE -- THROUGH 2 YOUR REGULATORY PROCESS ON THAT. 3 IT'S INTERESTING MR. FRAZEE ASKED AND MAKES VERY GOOD POINT WHEN HE SUGGESTED THAT 4 5 IF HE WERE REPRESENTING IRONCLAD, HE WOULD ASK FOR 6 EVERYBODY ELSE'S INFORMATION. MY CLIENT TURNED TO 7 ME AND SAID, "WELL, WHY DIDN'T YOU THINK OF THAT?" 8 THEN HE PURSUES THE POINT ABOUT WHY IS THIS BEING 9 REQUESTED. WE'RE TOLD THAT THE INFORMATION 10 ABOUT THE SOURCE OF OUR PCR IS BEING REQUESTED AS 11 PART OF A RESEARCH PROJECT, BROAD PUBLIC PURPOSES. 12 13 IT'S INTERESTING THAT THE REQUEST IS MADE OF ONLY IRONCLAD, AND WE HAVE SLIGHTLY MORE THAN ONE 14 PERCENT OF THE MARKET AND CONSEQUENTLY PROBABLY 15 16 BUY NO MORE THAN -- A LITTLE MORE THAN ONE PERCENT 17 OF THE PCR, SO IT LOOKS LIKE IT'S A FAIRLY NARROW 18 RESEARCH PROJECT AT THIS POINT. BUT CERTAINLY I WOULD LIKE TO 19 20 SUPPORT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION WITH RESPECT TO 21 THAT INFORMATION NOT BE MADE AVAILABLE IF YOU 22 DECIDE TO DEAL WITH IT NOW ALTHOUGH MY NOTION IS 23 IS THAT YOU OUGHT TO GO BACK AND START AT THE 24 BEGINNING WITH YOUR REGULATORY PROCESS. I'M NOT 25 EVEN SURE WHAT'S INVOLVED IN THE CERTIFICATE OF

1 NONCOMPLIANCE. I'VE NOT HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT THAT FORM. LIKE I SAY, WE ONLY GOT THIS LAST 2 3 NIGHT. I DON'T KNOW WHAT INFORMATION IS THERE AND 4 REALLY HAVE NO WAY OF ADDRESSING THAT PARTICULAR 5 ISSUE AS TO WHETHER THAT SHOULD BE PROTECTED OR б NOT. SO I WOULD ASK YOU TO DEFER ANY ACTION ON 7 THIS SO-CALLED AMENDED PRA REQUEST AT THIS TIME. 8 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. ANY QUESTIONS OF MR. LIVINGSTON? 9 MR. HART: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF I MIGHT JUST 10 11 CHIRP IN ON THE REQUEST NO. 1 REGARDING THE 12 CERTIFICATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE, THERE IS NO SUCH DOCUMENT. IRONCLAD DID NOT SUBMIT SUCH A 13 14 DOCUMENT, SO THAT SHOULDN'T BE A CONSIDERATION FOR 15 MAKING ANY DECISION. THERE ISN'T ANY SUCH 16 DOCUMENT. 17 MS. TOBIAS: ALSO, MR. CHAIR, I'D LIKE TO INDICATE THAT I THINK AT THIS TIME WE DO NOT 18 19 CONSIDER THIS TO BE -- WE'RE CALLING IT AN AMENDED PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST BECAUSE AS THE PUBLIC 20 21 RECORDS REQUEST WAS FILED, THEY ASKED FOR CERTAIN 22 INFORMATION. WHEN THERE WAS A QUESTION BROUGHT UP 23 ABOUT WHETHER THAT INFORMATION WOULD BE RELEASED,

THE QUESTION WAS THEN IF YOU WON'T GIVE ME THIS,

THEN CAN I HAVE THAT? I DON'T REALLY CONSIDER

2.4

- 1 THAT -- I THINK THIS IS ALL ONE REQUEST THAT WE'RE
- 2 DEALING WITH HERE. SO AS FAR AS PUTTING THIS OFF
- 3 AND HAVING IT GO BACK THROUGH THE PROCESS, I DON'T
- 4 THINK THAT'S REALLY APPROPRIATE UNLESS THERE'S
- 5 SOME OTHER INFORMATION THAT I'M NOT AWARE OF AT
- 6 THIS TIME.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: UNDER THE PUBLIC
- 8 RECORDS ACT, WHAT ARE THE TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR
- 9 RESPONDING TO A PUBLIC RECORDS?
- 10 MS. TOBIAS: TEN DAYS. WHAT WE CAN

DO IS

11 IF THERE'S A PROBLEM COMPLYING WITH THAT TEN

DAYS,

- 12 THEN YOU NOTIFY THE ENTITY THAT'S MADE THE
- 13 REQUEST, THAT WE'RE DOING OUR BEST TO COMPLY

WITH

14 THAT, TRY TO GIVE THEM SOME INDICATION OF

WHEN YOU

15 WILL RELEASE THAT INFORMATION OR PROVIDE

THAT

- 16 INFORMATION.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: SO IN

ADOPTING A

- 18 POLICY, TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE?
- 19 MS. TOBIAS: I'M SORRY. SAY THAT

Α	GA	TN	

- 21 POLICY ON THIS, THE TIME IS IMPORTANT?
- MS. TOBIAS: I'M NOT SURE WHERE WE

ARE IN

- THE PROCESS.
- BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: WELL, WITHOUT

_ _

25 LACKING TAKING ACTION ON THIS, THEN THAT'S A VALID

1 REQUEST THAT WE MUST HONOR WITHIN TEN DAYS? 2 MS. BORZELLERI: MR. FRAZEE, I JUST 3 WANTED TO CLARIFY. THE INITIAL REQUEST MUST BE RESPONDED TO IN TEN DAYS. WE HAVE MET THAT 4 5 REQUIREMENT BY TELLING THE REQUESTER THAT WE WERE 6 GOING TO BRING IT FORWARD TO THE BOARD. I BELIEVE 7 THAT'S WHAT OCCURRED ANYWAY. WE'VE DELAYED IT AND 8 MADE IT SUBJECT TO THE BOARD'S DETERMINATION. 9 ONE OTHER ISSUE THAT'S IMPORTANT IS THAT ONCE THE BOARD DOES MAKE THIS DETERMINATION, 10 THE REGULATIONS ALLOW FOR AN ADDITIONAL, I BELIEVE 11 IT'S, EITHER 15 OR 30 DAYS -- I NEED TO VERIFY 12 13 THAT IN REGULATION -- WHERE WE NOTIFY THE PERSON WHOSE INFORMATION WILL BE RELEASED, AND THEY CAN 14 COME BACK AND SUPPLY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IF 15 THEY WISH TO WITHIN, I BELIEVE IT'S, A 30-DAY 16 17 PERIOD, AND THEN THE BOARD COULD HEAR THAT AGAIN. 18 SO THE PROCESS ALLOWS FOR THE GIVE AND TAKE ONCE 19 THE DECISION IS MADE. 20 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: SO THE TEN-DAY 21 PERIOD IS ONLY THE RESPONSE TO THE REQUEST. IT'S 22 NOT TURNING OVER THE INFORMATION? 23 MS. BORZELLERI: CORRECT. IF WE'RE GOING 24 TO TURN OVER THE INFORMATION, WE SHOULD GIVE IT 25 WITHIN TEN DAYS, BUT WE MADE THE RESPONSE WITHIN

- 1 TEN DAYS, TELLING THEM THAT WE CONSIDER IT
- 2 CONFIDENTIAL OR THE BOARD NEEDS TO DETERMINE THAT
- 3 IT'S CONFIDENTIAL.
- 4 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: WE READY FOR THE
- 6 ITEM?
- 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I'M READY FOR A
- 8 MOTION.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I THINK STAFF NEEDS
- 10 TO HELP US WITH THIS MOTION, BUT THE STAFF
- 11 RECOMMENDATION. LET ME START AGAIN. I WOULD MOVE
- 12 THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THIS ITEM AS OUTLINED
- 13 IN ITEM 5, 1, 2, AND 3, AND THAT'S FURTHER
- 14 IDENTIFIED AS PAGE 94. THERE'S ALSO A
- 15 MODIFICATION OF THAT THAT WE DON'T HAVE IN WRITTEN
- 16 FORM.
- 17 MS. TRGOVCICH: I COULD JUST READ IT INTO
- 18 THE RECORD IF YOU WOULD LIKE. ITEM 2 WILL BE
- 19 REVISED TO READ THE "CUSTOMER LIST CONTAINED IN
- 20 SECTION C AND D OF IRONCLAD'S 1993 TRASH BAG
- 21 MANUFACTURER'S CERTIFICATION." ITEM 3 WOULD READ
- 22 "THE RPPCM SUPPLIER LIST CONTAINED IN SECTION E --
- 23 SECTIONS E AND F OF IRONCLAD'S 1994 AND 1995 TRASH
- 24 BAG MANUFACTURER'S CERTIFICATION."
- 25 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: THAT IS MY MOTION.

1 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: SECOND THE MOTION. 2 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND 3 SECONDED. FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION? 4 NOT, WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL. 5 BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO. 6 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE. 7 BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE. 8 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE. 9 BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH. 10 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE. 11 BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS. 12 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE. 13 BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON. 14 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. MOTION 15 CARRIES. 16 I SEE IT'S TIME TO BREAK, SO WE WILL 17 RECESS FOR LUNCH. BACK AT 1:30. OKAY. RECESS 18 FOR LUNCH. BE BACK AT 1:30. 19 (RECESS TAKEN.) 20 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: GOOD AFTERNOON. 21 AND WE'LL CALL BACK TO ORDER THE NOVEMBER MEETING 22 OF THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT 23 BOARD. FIRST, LET ME ASK IF ANYBODY HAS ANY EX 24 PARTES THEY NEED TO DO. 25 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: YES. I HAD A

1 CONVERSATION WITH MR. TAKALLOU WITH REGARDS TO THE 2 TIRE ALLOCATION. 3 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: THE WORD "MESQUITE" UTTERED OUT OF JOHN CUPPS' MOUTH, SO I WILL REPORT 4 5 IT AS AN EX PARTE. 6 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: BOY, IF WE HAVE TO 7 REPORT EVERY CONVERSATION WITH OUR WIVES, WE'RE IN 8 DEEP TROUBLE, ALL EXCEPT MRS. GOTCH. 9 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: I DON'T HAVE A WIFE. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. LET'S SEE. 10 WHERE DID WE LEAVE OFF? I THINK 31, RIGHT? 11 MOVING RIGHT ALONG THEN. CONSIDERATION OF THE 12 13 TIRE PROGRAM PRIORITIES AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS. DOROTHY RICE AND CAREN TRGOVCICH. 14 MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND 15 16 BOARD MEMBERS. DOROTHY RICE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF 17 PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION. I'LL BE 18 PRESENTING THIS ITEM JOINTLY WITH CAREN TRGOVCICH, DEPUTY DIRECTOR WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET 19 20 DEVELOPMENT DIVISION. 21 THIS ITEM IS CONSIDERATION OF TIRE 22 PROGRAM FUNDING ALLOCATIONS. I THOUGHT I WOULD

JUST VERY BRIEFLY REPEAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT

HAVE COME OUT OF PRIOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS JUST AS

SETTING SOME CONTEXT FOR US THIS AFTERNOON.

23

24

1 YOU KNOW, THE POLICY COMMITTEE HAS MET CONSECUTIVELY IN SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER, AND NOVEMBER 2 3 TO DISCUSS ASPECTS OF THIS ITEM THAT IS AGAIN BEFORE THE FULL BOARD TODAY. 4 5 IN SEPTEMBER THE COMMITTEE DISCUSSED 6 INPUT FROM THE SEPTEMBER WORKSHOP ON THESE ISSUES 7 AND IN OCTOBER ADOPTED A NUMBER OF RECOMMENDA-8 TIONS, WHICH ARE LISTED ON PAGES 116 AND 117 OF 9 YOUR PACKETS. THESE RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDE ADOPTION OF A LONG-TERM POLICY STATEMENT AND 10 11 OBJECTIVES FOR THE TIRE PROGRAM, WHICH YOU CAN 12 FIND ON PAGE 117 OF YOUR PACKET, ALSO A 13 RECOMMENDATION THAT A TIRE ADVISORY COMMITTEE BE ESTABLISHED WAS RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMITTEE IN 14 15 OCTOBER, AND A NUMBER OF FUNDING ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS WERE MADE. THE CHART DISPLAYING 16 17 THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OCTOBER POLICY 18 COMMITTEE MEETING CAN BE FOUND ON PAGE 118 OF THE 19 MATERIALS IN YOUR PACKETS. 20 THEN, AGAIN, IN NOVEMBER THE 21 COMMITTEE MET A FEW WEEKS AGO TO FURTHER DISCUSS 22 AND REFINE THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN 23 DEVELOPED INITIALLY AT THE OCTOBER MEETING. AT 24 THE NOVEMBER COMMITTEE MEETING THE COMMITTEE 25 RECOMMENDED A FEW ADDITIONAL ITEMS, ONE

1 LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS RELATED TO THE TIRE PROGRAM 2 ELEMENTS, THAT A DISCUSSION OF THESE BE REFERRED 3 TO THE LEGISLATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMITTEE FOR DISCUSSION, I BELIEVE, IN DECEMBER, AND THAT 4 WOULD EXCLUDE THOSE ASPECTS OF TIRE LEGISLATION 5 6 THAT HAVE ALREADY BEEN DETERMINED BY THE BOARD 7 THROUGH OTHER PROCESSES. 8 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: IF I MAY, MR. CHAIR, 9 I WANT TO CLARIFY THE LEGISLATION PROPOSALS THAT I HAD BROUGHT UP IN COMMITTEE, AND THAT WAS AFTER 10 DISCUSSIONS WITH STAFF. I'M FINE WITH ALLOWING 11 THE NORMAL LEGISLATIVE PROCESS TO PROCEED. AS I 12 13 UNDERSTAND THAT, WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT WE'LL WAIT FOR THE REQUISITE ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL OF 14 THE BOARD'S LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS, AND THEY DON'T 15 16 NEED TO COME TO LPAC PRIOR TO APPROVAL. 17 HOWEVER, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK STAFF 18 TO FORMALLY RELAY TO ME AS SOON AS POSSIBLE WHAT LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS THE ADMINISTRATION HAS 19 20 APPROVED OR DENIED. 21 MS. RICE: CERTAINLY. THANK YOU. 22 THE SECOND ITEM THAT THE COMMITTEE 23 MADE A RECOMMENDATION ON AT THE OCTOBER MEETING 24 WAS THAT -- RATHER NOVEMBER -- THAT THE PROPERTY 25 OWNER REIMBURSEMENT ISSUE BE FURTHER DEVELOPED BY

- 1 THE LEGAL OFFICE AND BROUGHT BACK TO THE POLICY
- 2 COMMITTEE IN JANUARY, AS MAY BE APPROPRIATE, BASED
- 3 ON ADDITIONAL RESEARCH DONE.
- 4 AND THIRDLY, TIRE PROGRAM FUNDING
- 5 ALLOCATIONS WERE MODIFIED AS SHOWN IN THE TABLE ON
- 6 PAGE 120 AND I BELIEVE AS CAREN HAS PUT UP ON THE
- 7 MONITOR. AND IF THE BOARD MEMBERS WOULD LIKE, WE
- 8 COULD VERY BRIEFLY RUN THROUGH WHAT THOSE WERE.
- 9 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WHAT'S YOUR WISH?
- 10 DO YOU WANT TO GO THROUGH THESE, OR SHOULD WE NOT?
- 11 I KNOW WE HAVE SOME CHANGES. I THINK WE HAVE,
- 12 DON'T WE?
- 13 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: LET'S GO TO THE
- 14 HEART OF THE MATTER.
- 15 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: CAN WE GET RIGHT TO
- 16 THE HEART OF THE MATTER?
- 17 MS. RICE: OKAY. THANK YOU.
- 18 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I'LL START IT OFF
- 19 BY PUTTING FORWARD A MOTION TO ADOPT -- I'LL TRY
- 20 TO GO SLOW SO EVERYBODY CAN KEEP UP WITH WHAT I'M
- 21 TRYING TO DO HERE.
- 22 THEN I'LL MOVE THAT WE ADOPT THE
- 23 COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION ON THE POLICY STATEMENT
- 24 AND OBJECTIVES REGARDING WASTE TIRES. THIS IS THE
- 25 LANGUAGE THAT'S ON PAGE 117. THE ADOPTION OF NO.

1 5, THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO UTILIZE AN AD 2 HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO ADVISE THE BOARD ON TIRE 3 PROGRAMS AND FUNDING, I WOULD STRIKE THAT, SO WE DELETE THAT. THE FOLLOWING ALLOCATIONS OF FUNDS: 4 5 PILOT LEA GRANT PROGRAM, 200,000; HIGHWAY PATROL 6 INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT, A HUNDRED THOUSAND; 7 DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES INTERAGENCY 8 AGREEMENT, 15,000; 9 STATE CLEANUP CONTRACTS, 750 TO 1.5 MILLION; 750 IS THE MINIMUM; THE 1.5 IS THE 10 MAXIMUM. THIS ALLOWS THE BOARD TO AUGMENT THE 750 11 12 WITH UNALLOCATED FUNDS IN THE FUTURE WITHOUT 13 ADDITIONAL BIDDING PROCESSES. STAFF WILL DEVELOP A REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS TO DEVELOP A BIDDER 14 LIST FOR EXPENDITURES OF THESE FUNDS. SO THAT'S 15 REALLY 750 AT THIS POINT. 16 17 LOCAL GOVERNMENT CLEANUP MATCHING 18 GRANTS, 250,000. THESE GRANTS WILL BE 50-50 MATCHING GRANTS. 19 20 FIRE MARSHAL INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT, 21 A HUNDRED THOUSAND. 22 STATEWIDE CENTER FOR RUBBERIZED ASPHALT, 500,000. THE CENTER WILL BE FOR 23

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE,

TRAINING, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION BETWEEN

2425

LOCAL

1 GOVERNMENTS. 2 FINANCIAL SERVICES, AGAIN, THE MINIMUM WOULD BE 50,000, IS AUTHORIZED TO BE 3 ENCUMBERED NOW. THE 75 IS A CAP TO ALLOW 4 5 AUGMENTATION IN THE FUTURE, IF NECESSARY, AND 6 FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE. COAL AND COGENERATION 7 TESTING, 200,000; CEMENT KILN INFORMATION 8 DISSEMINATION, 50,000. 9 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I'D LIKE TO INTERRUPT, MR. CHAIRMAN, AND SAY I'M GLAD THAT 10 11 SOMEBODY FINALLY STOPPED REPRODUCING THAT TYPO 12 THAT SAID CEMENT KILT. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY 13 TIMES I'VE SEEN THAT, AND IT FINALLY GOT SPELLED 14 K-I-L-N. 15 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THEY WERE ACTUALLY TRYING TO SKIRT THE ISSUE. I JUST WANTED TO SEE 16 17 IF YOU ALL WERE AWAKE. 18 LOCAL GOVERNMENT SCHOOL DISTRICT PLAYGROUND MATS, 250,000. THESE ARE MATCHING 19 20 GRANTS OF 70 PERCENT LOCAL FUNDS, 30 PERCENT BOARD 21 FUNDS. THESE GRANTS ARE AVAILABLE TO THE LOCAL 22 GOVERNMENT, SUBDIVISIONS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, 23 INCLUDING SCHOOL DISTRICTS, FOR THE USE OF 24 RECYCLED RUBBER IN PLAYGROUND RECONSTRUCTION. 25 A PRUDENT RESERVE OF 500,000.

1 SPECIFIED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EXPENDITURES OF 2 FUNDS WILL BE PRESENTED THROUGH THE POLICY 3 COMMITTEE AND BOARD APPROVEMENT AS NECESSARY. LOCAL GOVERNMENT RUBBERIZED ASPHALT 4 MATCHING GRANTS, 200,000. THESE MATCHING GRANTS 5 6 ARE TO BE 70 LOCAL, 30 BOARD. 7 RMDZ LOAN FOR TIRE RECYCLING, 8 230,000. 9 THIS IS 3,395,000. AND IF THERE'S ANY OTHER ADJUSTMENT, WHICH I THINK THERE'S 10 ACTUALLY \$500 OFF THAT CAN COME OUT OF THE RMDZ 11 12 LOAN LINE. 13 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: ARE YOU DONE? I'LL SECOND THAT. 14 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: SO... 15 16 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, 17 THERE'S SEVERAL ISSUES. I HAVE A COUPLE AND I 18 KNOW MRS. GOTCH HAS ONE. FIRST OF ALL, I WANTED TO KIND OF SUMMARIZE. I APPRECIATE THE FACT THAT 19 20 THERE'S BEEN A MOVEMENT TOWARDS INCLUDING THE 21 RECYCLED RUBBERIZED ASPHALT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS 22 FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, AND I WANTED TO PROVIDE A 23 FEW MORE SPECIFICS THAT WE CAN PERHAPS PUT INTO 24 THE MOTION TO CLARIFY WHAT THE INTENT WAS. 25 BEFORE I DO THAT THOUGH, LET ME SAY

1	THAT WHAT I HAD IN MIND WAS TO HELP CORRECT A
2	SIMILAR PROBLEM THAT WE RECENTLY CORRECTED BY
3	FUNDING ADDITIONAL COMPOST DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS
4	WHERE WE WERE DOING A GREAT JOB IN SOME PARTS OF
5	THE STATE AND OTHER IMPORTANT PARTS WERE
6	ESSENTIALLY NOT KEEPING UP BECAUSE WE HADN'T
7	ALLOCATED MONEY, SO WE ADDED ANOTHER THREE COMPOST
8	PROJECTS TO THE FIVE THAT WE HAD ALREADY DONE.
9	AND MY RATIONALE IN SUGGESTING THIS
10	IS THAT WE HAVE IN THIS PROPOSAL, BEFORE YOU
11	INCLUDED THIS, A PRETTY HEAVY FOCUS ON SOUTHERN
12	CALIFORNIA EVEN THOUGH I KNOW IT'S DESCRIBED AS A
13	STATEWIDE CENTER, BUT GEOGRAPHICALLY, LIKE THE
14	COMPOST PROJECTS, I FEEL THAT THERE'S A LOT MORE
15	CREDIBILITY, GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS SHOWING OTHER
16	GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN A REGIONAL WAY, JUST LIKE
17	THE FARMERS SHOWING THE FARMERS IN THEIR AREA,
18	RATHER THAN HAVING SO MUCH OF THE ACTIVITY IN
19	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, WHICH HAS HAPPENED TO DATE.
20	I AM IN SUPPORT OF FUNDING THE
21	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CENTER, BUT I THINK THAT WE
22	NEED TO PROVIDE SOME COUNTERBALANCE TO MAKE SURE
23	THAT ALL OF THE ACTIVITY DOESN'T TAKE PLACE IN
24 25	L.A. AND ORANGE COUNTIES BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE THERE'S A LOT OF GOOD WORK TO THEIR CREDIT TAKING

1 PLACE. 2 SO I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE 3 PRIORITIZE THE AREAS OF THE STATE THAT HAVE A LOWER LEVEL OF RAC USE TO DATE FOR USE OF THOSE 4 5 FUNDS. 6 SECONDLY, I'M STILL HOPEFUL THAT WE 7 CAN FIND A WAY TO -- AND THIS DISCUSSION WILL 8 ENSUE -- BUT WE CAN FIND A WAY TO FUND AT A 9 \$250,000 LEVEL AS OPPOSED TO A \$200,000 LEVEL. I ALSO THINK THAT IT SHOULD BE INTERAGENCY 10 AGREEMENTS RATHER THAN A COMPETITIVE PROCESS 11 12 BECAUSE I THINK OUR STAFF AND THE COMMITTEE SHOULD 13 PLAY A ROLE IN TRYING TO DETERMINE WHAT AREAS OF THE STATE THOSE ARE AND PRIORITIZE THE AREAS THAT 14 SEEM TO NEED THE MOST HELP IN TERMS OF SOME 15 16 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS. 17 I ALSO WOULD SPECIFY A RATIO OF 18 50-50 MATCHING FUNDS, ALTHOUGH I'M WILLING TO CONSIDER OTHER RATIOS. I KNOW THAT THERE WERE 19 20 OTHER THOUGHTS ABOUT WHAT THOSE SHOULD BE. I 21 THINK THAT THE MAXIMUM PER PROJECT SHOULD BE 22 \$50,000. AND IN ADDITION TO THAT, IT WOULD BE --23 INSTEAD OF JUST DOING DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS 24 COMPLETELY INDEPENDENT OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA 25 CENTER, I THINK WE SHOULD BE TRYING TO HELP THESE

1 SELECTED JURISDICTIONS TO DO APPLICATIONS OF 2 RUBBERIZED ASPHALT, BUT IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE 3 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CENTER. SO I THINK ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS 4 OF THE PROJECT AND PERHAPS EVEN A SMALL USE OF 5 6 SOME OF THE FUNDS WOULD BE FOR THEM TO GO DOWN AND 7 TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE THAT'S 8 BEING PROVIDED SO THAT THESE PROJECTS ARE 9 COORDINATED AND IT'S NOT COMPLETELY CONSIDERED AN INDEPENDENT ACTIVITY FROM WHAT THE BOARD'S 10 INTENTIONS ARE WITH THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA 11 12 CENTER. 13 THOSE ARE BASICALLY THE PARAMETERS OR CLOSE TO THE PARAMETERS I'D LIKE TO SEE 14 INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION. AND I GUESS I'LL 15 16 SEE WHAT KIND OF RESPONSE THERE IS TO THAT, AND 17 THEN I'LL MOVE ON TO ANOTHER ISSUE. 18 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. WHAT YOU'D LIKE TO DO IS ADD ANOTHER 50,000 TO THE RUBBERIZED 19 20 ASPHALT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT MATCHING GRANTS. 21 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: RIGHT. 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WHERE WOULD YOU 23 PROPOSE TO GET THAT 50,000? 24 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WELL, THAT LEADS

ME INTO MY NEXT LINE -- ACTUALLY IT WAS A LINE OF

1 QUESTIONING HAD TO DO WITH THE SO-CALLED PRUDENT RESERVE AND WHAT, FIRST OF ALL, WHAT THE MAGIC WAS 2 3 ABOUT THE PARTICULAR NUMBER THAT'S ASSIGNED THERE 4 TO THAT. 5 AND SECONDLY, TO HAVE SOME IDEA OF 6 THE RANGE OF THE POSSIBILITIES THAT THAT IS 7 INTENDED FOR. I KNOW I'VE HEARD SOME THINGS 8 THROWN AROUND, BUT IT WOULD BE GOOD TO HAVE ON THE 9 RECORD, I THINK, SOME DISCUSSION HERE ABOUT WHAT IT WOULD BE USED FOR. SO I GUESS TO ANSWER YOUR 10 QUESTION MORE DIRECTLY, I THINK THAT'S ONE 11 12 POSSIBLE SOURCE. 13 AND THERE -- RATHER THAN TAKING ALL OF THE 50,000 FROM ANY ONE -- ADDITIONAL 50,000 14 FROM ANY ONE SOURCE, I GUESS I WOULD SUGGEST THAT 15 16 IT BE SMALL AMOUNTS TAKEN FROM DIFFERENT OTHER 17 ACCOUNTS IN ORDER TO MINIMIZE THE IMPACTS ON THE 18 PRIORITIES THAT THE COMMITTEE'S ALREADY SET. IT COULD GO TWO WAYS OR THREE WAYS IN TERMS OF OTHER 19 20 PROJECTS, SUCH AS THE COAL PROJECT COMES TO MIND, 21 THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PROJECT COMES TO MIND. IF 22 WE TOOK 20 OR 25,000 AWAY FROM THE SOUTHERN 23 CALIFORNIA PROJECT, I DON'T THINK IT WOULD BE A 24 SEVERE HIT. SO I THINK THERE'S SEVERAL OTHER WAYS

TO TRY TO GET THAT UP TO 50.

1 BUT BACK TO MY QUESTION, MY QUESTION 2 HAS TO DO WITH WHAT THE -- HOW THE 500,000 RESERVE 3 WAS SET AND WHAT IT'S INTENDED POTENTIAL USES ARE. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: YOU KNOW, I MORE OR 4 LESS SET THAT FIGURE, AND I DID BASED UPON THE 5 6 FACT THAT IN THE LAST YEAR WE'VE HAD TWO MAJOR 7 TIRE FIRES IN THE STATE, ONE OF THEM THAT WE HAD 8 TO MOBILIZE PEOPLE AND EQUIPMENT. IT WAS 9 SERIOUSLY DAMAGING OR COULD SERIOUSLY HAVE DAMAGED 10 THE POWER SUPPLY TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND COST ABOUT A MILLION DOLLARS A DAY LOSS IF WE HAD NOT 11 BEEN ABLE TO MOVE IN THERE QUICKLY AND DO 12 13 SOMETHING TO ALLEVIATE THE PROBLEM. 14 WE WERE CERTAINLY HELPED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, BUT WE WERE LOOKED AT FOR 15 16 FUNDS, AND WE WERE LOOKED AT FOR AN OBLIGATION 17 THERE. 18 WE ALSO HAD A FIRE IN BAKERSFIELD NOT TOO LONG AGO. AND AGAIN, WE WERE LOOKED TO 19 20 FOR FUNDING. AND I THINK THAT STAFF CAN TELL YOU 21 MORE IN TERMS OF WHAT ALL OF THAT COST WAS. 22 THERE ARE SEVERAL OTHER LARGE TIRE

PILES AROUND THE STATE THAT ARE OF GREAT

CONCERN;

AND, OF COURSE, THE MAJOR ONE IS THE OXFORD

TIRE

25 PILE, AND I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE FACT THAT THAT'S

1 LOCATED CLOSE TO A SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER 2 SUPPLY. IT'S CLOSE TO THE MAJOR NORTH/SOUTH 3 HIGHWAY. IT'S LOCATED IN A FLIGHT PATH INTO SAN 4 FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL. AND YOU GET THAT KIND OF 5 HEAVY SMOKE GOING UP THERE, THAT IT COULD AFFECT 6 THAT. 7 SO I THINK WE HAVE TO BE AS 8 CONCERNED, AND OUR OBLIGATION IS TO BE CONCERNED 9 ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE PEOPLE, SO I FELT THAT WE NEEDED TO HAVE AT LEAST 10 11 ENOUGH FUNDING AVAILABLE TO MOVE QUICKLY IN CASE 12 THAT THERE WAS SOME SITUATION THAT OCCURRED 13 THROUGHOUT THE STATE. 14 ALSO, THAT THERE ARE SOME DISCUSSIONS GOING ON BETWEEN US AND OTHERS, MELP 15 AND OXFORD PEOPLE, THAT WE MAY TURN TO A FUND 16 17 SOURCE TO HELP ALLEVIATE THAT PROBLEM AND TO WORK 18 IN THAT. SO I WANT TO BE AS FLEXIBLE AS POSSIBLE, BUT I WANT TO HAVE ENOUGH MONEY IN OUR POCKET TO 19 20 DO IT. WE ALSO KNOW THAT WE'RE FACING A DEFICIT 21 OF OUR OWN ACROSS THE BOARD. AND IF WE DON'T SET 22 ASIDE SOME MONEY TO TAKE CARE OF AN EMERGENCY 23 SITUATION OR TO HELP ALLEVIATE THESE LEGACY PILES,

THEN I THINK WE'RE NOT LIVING UP TO OUR

RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF

24

1 THE CITIZENS OF CALIFORNIA. 2 SO THAT'S WHY I CAME TO THAT FIGURE 3 AND A FIGURE THAT I THINK IS NOT EXCESSIVE, BUT IS 4 PRUDENT AND, AS I'VE SAID, WE GET TO, YOU KNOW, 5 APRIL OR MAY AND WE HAVEN'T USED IT, THEN WE CAN 6 COME BACK AND REVISIT WHERE WE MAY FEEL THAT WE 7 NEED TO PUT ADDITIONAL FUNDING INTO OTHER 8 CATEGORIES THAT WE DECIDE ON TODAY. 9 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: MR. CHAIR, FIRST OF ALL, I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS THE COMMENTS THAT YOU 10 JUST MADE. WHILE I AGREE WITH WHAT YOU ARE SAYING 11 IN SOME RESPECTS, WE HAVE LINE ITEMS ABOVE FOR 12 13 EMERGENCIES SUCH AS YOU SPOKE OF AND FINANCIAL ASSURANCES FOR THAT REASON. THE AMOUNT THAT WE 14 HAVE FOR THE PRUDENT RESERVE IS ARBITRARY, AND WE 15 16 WILL HAVE MORE MONEY NEXT YEAR THAT WE CAN ADD TO 17 THAT. 18 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THAT DOESN'T DO 19 ANYTHING FOR US BETWEEN NOW AND NEXT JULY. WE 20 NEED TO BE ABLE TO -- WE DON'T NEED TO LOCK 21 OURSELVES IN TO A POINT WHERE WE CAN'T DO ANYTHING 22 BETWEEN NOW AND NEXT JULY WAITING FOR THE NEXT 23 PAYCHECK. YOU KNOW, WE -- WHEN WE GET THERE AND 24 WE'RE ALMOST GOING TO HAVE THE NEXT PAYCHECK, THEN 25 WE CAN SPREAD THIS OUT, BUT WE NEED TO BE IN A

```
1
      POSITION TO REACT.
 2
                    I DON'T KNOW WHERE -- FINANCIAL
 3
      ASSURANCES, EVERY ONE OF THESE TIRE PILES, EVERY
      ONE OF THESE THINGS THAT WE COME TO, IT'S SOMEBODY
 4
 5
      WHO IS BANKRUPT AND WE'RE NOT GETTING ANY MONEY
 6
      OFF OF THEM. WE DON'T HAVE ANY PROPERTY WE CAN
 7
             I DON'T THINK WE'VE LIENED A PIECE OF
 8
      PROPERTY IN THE TIRE PILE THAT WE'VE CLEANED UP.
 9
      SO I DON'T KNOW WHERE THIS MONEY IS.
               BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: IF I MAY, I'D LIKE
10
      TO GO AHEAD WITH SOME ADDITIONS THAT I'D LIKE TO
11
      MAKE ON THIS. AND THAT IS WITH THE PLAYGROUND
12
13
      MATCHING GRANTS. I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE 50,000 OUT
      OF THE PRUDENT RESERVE, WHICH I FEEL THAT WE DO
14
      ADDRESS IN OUR LINE ITEMS ABOVE FOR EMERGENCIES,
15
      AND ADD THAT TO MAKE A TOTAL OF 300,000 AS WHAT
16
17
      WAS AGREED UPON EARLIER IN COMMITTEE.
18
                    ALSO, I'D LIKE THE MATCHING PROPOSAL
      TO BE 50-50. IT WILL -- 70-30 IS TOO PROHIBITIVE,
19
      AND 50-50 MATCH WILL BRING MORE PEOPLE TO THE
20
21
      TABLE. I THINK ALSO IT WILL ASSIST RURAL
22
      JURISDICTIONS THAT CAN'T QUITE AFFORD TO GET INTO
23
      THE PROGRAM UNLESS WE CAN GIVE THEM A 50-50 MATCH.
24
                    AND, FINALLY, I'D LIKE A SUFFICIENT
25
      UPPER BOUND ON THIS ITEM IN CASE THERE IS MONEY
```

- 1 LEFT OVER THAT CAN BE USED TO FUND ADDITIONAL
- 2 PLAYGROUND SITES.
- 3 AND, FINALLY, I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS
- 4 THE LETTER THAT WE HAD RECEIVED FROM MR.
- 5 HARRINGTON ON THIS. I BELIEVE WE ALL RECEIVED
- 6 THIS. HE HAD BROUGHT UP SEVERAL SUGGESTIONS
- 7 INCLUDING SCHOOLS THAT ARE ACCREDITED BY THE STATE
- 8 OF CALIFORNIA ARE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR GRANT
- 9 FUNDING. ACTUALLY I GUESS I'D LIKE TO ASK IF
- 10 STAFF HAS ANY RESPONSE TO ANY OF THESE REQUESTS,
- 11 IF YOU'VE HAD A CHANCE TO LOOK AT THIS LETTER.
- MS. TRGOVCICH: WE'VE NOT RECEIVED THE
- 13 LETTER.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: I'LL GIVE YOU MY
- 15 COPY OF THIS. IT'S ADDRESSED TO EVERYONE. IT'S
- 16 ADDRESSED TO EACH OF THE BOARD MEMBERS, SO I HAD
- 17 ASSUMED THAT EVERYONE ELSE HAD RECEIVED
- A COPY. I
- 18 WOULD ASSUME, ALSO, THAT MR. HARRINGTON
- IS
- 19 PROBABLY ON ONE OF THE SPEAKER SLIPS WE
- HAVE AND
- 20 SOMETHING WE CAN TAKE UP. IS HE HERE?
- THERE YOU
- 21 ARE. WE'LL GET COPIES OF THAT THEN.

22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: YOU RAISE

THAT, AND

23 I DON'T THINK HE'S ON THIS LIST HERE.

SO I WOULD

24 SUGGEST THAT -- REMIND EVERYBODY, IF YOU

WANT TO

25 SPEAK, THERE'S SPEAKER SLIPS BACK THERE THAT NEED

- 1 TO BE FILLED OUT AND GIVEN TO MS. KELLY. 2 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AND THOSE 3 SUGGESTIONS CAN WAIT. I THINK I'VE MADE THE POINT I WANTED TO MAKE THEN. THANK YOU. 4 5 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: LET ME JUST MAKE A 6 COMMENT ABOUT THE RUBBERIZED MATS, THAT WE'RE ONLY 7 LOOKING TO TAKE \$50,000 OUT OF THAT. AND OVER THE 8 LAST THREE FISCAL YEARS, WE'VE SPENT 261,000 ON 9 THIS ALREADY. NOW WE'RE TALKING UPWARDS OF OVER A HALF A MILLION DOLLARS ON PLAYGROUND GRANTS, BUT 10 11 YET WE DON'T WANT TO PROTECT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY 12 BY HAVING A PRUDENT RESERVE. 13 I THINK THAT, YOU KNOW, WE SAID WE'D TAKE 50,000 OUT AND WE'D LOOK AT PUTTING SOME IN 14 IF WE GOT THROUGH THE YEAR. THE ONLY REASON I 15 16 LIKE THE 70-30 OR I'D BE WILLING TO ADJUST THAT 17 AROUND A LITTLE BIT, BUT I'M TRYING TO SPREAD THE 18 MONEY AS FAR AS WE CAN. YOU KNOW, THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS DO GET A LOT OF MONEY FROM A LOT OF 19 20 PLACES. 21 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: ACTUALLY THE SCHOOL 22 DISTRICTS ARE HAVING A REALLY TOUGH TIME.
- 23 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WELL, THE GOVERNOR
 24 JUST GAVE THEM A WHOLE BUNCH MORE MONEY. WE'RE
 25 NOT HERE TO RUN THE SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

1 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: THIS IS NOT JUST THE 2 SCHOOL SYSTEMS. THESE ARE LOCAL AND STATE PARKS. 3 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: LOCAL AND STATE 4 PARKS. 5 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: ALL PLAYGROUNDS. I 6 THINK YOU RECEIVED A WHITE PAPER FROM ME ON THE 7 PROPOSAL THAT EXPLAINS HOW THIS IS TO BE USED. 8 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I GUESS THE 9 QUESTION I WOULD ASK ABOUT PRUDENT RESERVE IS --IS IF WE HAVE BACK BEFORE US IN, LET'S SAY, A 10 11 MONTH FROM NOW OR TWO MONTHS FROM NOW A SPECIFIC 12 PROPOSAL TO USE THIS MONEY SOMEHOW IN CONJUNCTION 13 WITH EITHER THE TIRE PILE OR THE POWER PLANT, IS 14 THE SAME ARGUMENT GOING TO STAND, THAT WE CAN'T 15 SPEND IT ON THAT BECAUSE WE HAVE TO BE PREPARED TO 16 FIGHT A FIRE? ARE WE GOING TO SAY NO TO THAT 17 BECAUSE WE GOT TO HAVE 500,000 IN CASE THERE'S A 18 FIRE? 19 I HEAR SEVERAL DIFFERENT THINGS 20 BEING SAID ABOUT THIS MONEY THAT IT ABSOLUTELY HAS 21 TO BE AVAILABLE FOR. I DON'T THINK WE'RE GOING TO

BE ABLE TO DO ALL OF THEM IF, IN FACT, WE

- 23 ABSOLUTELY HAVE TO HAVE ALL OF IT FOR ONE PURPOSE
- 24 AND WE ABSOLUTELY HAVE TO HAVE ALL OF IT FOR
- 25 ANOTHER PURPOSE. AND...

1 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WELL, I SUPPOSE YOU 2 COULD SAY THAT, AND I SUPPOSE IF WE HAD A FIRE NEXT WEEK, WE COULD SPEND IT ALL AND WOULDN'T HAVE 4 ANY MONEY TO COVER ANOTHER FIRE. YOU'RE RIGHT, 5 THAT IF THERE'S A PROPOSAL NEXT MONTH OR THE 6 FOLLOWING MONTH TO SPEND THE MONEY TO CLEAN UP 7 EIGHT MILLION TIRES OR START WHACKING AT THEM, WE STILL MAY HAVE SOME RESERVE LEFT BY THE TIME WE 8 GET TO THE END OF THE FISCAL YEAR. I MEAN 9 YOU'RE 10 RIGHT. I MEAN WE ONLY HAVE SO MUCH MONEY. I 11 BELIEVE WE NEED TO KEEP IT IN OUR POCKET. AND ΙF 12 IT'S \$400,000, THEN IT'S GOING TO BE GONE QUICKER. IF IT'S 300,000. I JUST -- YES, YOU ARE RIGHT. 13 14 IF THERE IS A FIRE, IT MAY EAT IT ALL UP; BUT 15 LEASTWISE WE'RE NOT STANDING THERE SAYING, "GEE. 16 OH, WHIZ. WE CAN'T HELP BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE ANY 17 MONEY."

BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: I'D LIKE TO REMIND

ALSO								
20	TALKED ABOUT TRYING TO HAVE MORE OF A 50-50							
BREAK								
21	BETWEEN PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT AND							
REMEDIATION								
22	AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT. AND THESE ARE BOTH							
MARKET								
23	DEVELOPMENT ITEMS THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. I'M							
24 25	LOOKING AT THE PRUDENT RESERVE IS WHAT I'M DISCUSSING.							

THE BOARD MEMBERS, THEN, IN COMMITTEE WE HAD

1 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I JUST WANTED TO 2 JUMP INTO THIS DISCUSSION ON SEVERAL ITEMS. BUT 3 FIRST OF ALL, I THINK THERE'S A NEED TO GO BACK AND LOOK AT OUR ENABLING ACT AS WE ALLOCATE FUNDS 4 5 OF THIS TYPE AND WHAT ARE WE CHARGED WITH DOING. 6 FIRST OF ALL, TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH, 7 SAFETY, AND PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT, AND THAT'S 8 SORT OF THE OVERRIDING GOAL. AND ALONG WITH THAT, 9 ALL THE OTHER WORTHWHILE GOALS OF REDUCING THE WASTE STREAM RECYCLING MATERIALS. 10 AND WEIGHING THOSE IN CONTEXT OF 11 THAT, I HAVE SOME CONCERNS OVER BOTH THE ASPHALT 12 13 PAVING AND THE PLAYGROUND PROPOSALS. AND AT ONE POINT, CERTAINLY LAST TIME THAT WE REVIEWED THIS 14 IN THE PREVIOUS CYCLE, I WAS TOTALLY SUPPORTIVE OF 15 16 THE CRUMB RUBBER USE IN ASPHALT AS BEING A 17 WORTHWHILE EFFORT BECAUSE I FELT THAT IT WAS 18 SOMETHING WE NEEDED TO DO TO DEMONSTRATE THAT IT REALLY WORKS TO GET SOME TEST SECTIONS OUT AND SEE 19 20 IF EVERYTHING WORKS WELL BEFORE WE START SELLING 21 IT TO THE PUBLIC. SINCE THAT TIME, I'VE LEARNED A 22 LOT MORE ABOUT THE SUBJECT, AND I'VE FOUND IN THE 23 CASE OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY THAT THERE'S ALREADY A 24 THOUSAND LANE MILES OF CRUMB RUBBER ASPHALT OUT 25 THERE.

THE AMOUNT OF DEMONSTRATION THAT 1 NEEDS TO BE DONE, I THINK, HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED. 2 3 SO THEN THAT GOES TO WHAT IS THE OTHER GOAL HERE, 4 AND THAT IS ARE WE IN THE BUSINESS OF JUST HELPING 5 OUT LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH A COST ISSUE. AND I б DON'T THINK THAT'S OUR ROLE IN EITHER ONE OF THESE 7 CASES, IN THE PLAYGROUNDS OR IN ASPHALT PAVING. 8 THEY'RE NICE THINGS TO DO, BUT I THINK AT THIS POINT IN TIME THAT WE HAVE TO LOOK 9 10 AT THE PRACTICAL THINGS TO DO AND NOT THE NICE 11 THINGS TO DO AND ONES THAT ARE GOING TO GET US TO 12 RESOLVING THAT PROBLEM. THE BIG OVERRIDING HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE ISSUE OUT THERE AT 13 14 THIS POINT ARE LEGACY TIRE PILES, AND THAT'S WHERE 15 I THINK OUR EMPHASIS HAS TO BE. 16 ANYTHING WE DO BEYOND THAT THAT HELPS STIMULATE MARKETS IS CERTAINLY WORTHWHILE, 17 18 BUT I THINK WE NEED TO BE VERY CAREFUL WHERE WE'RE REALLY DOING SOMETHING TO STIMULATE MARKETS OR ARE 19 20 WE JUST DOING SOMETHING TO BE NICE BECAUSE SCHOOLS 21 ARE SHORT OF MONEY AND NEED PLAYGROUNDS. I'D LIKE 22 TO BE ABLE TO BUY PLAYGROUND MATS FOR EVERY SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA, BUT THAT'S NOT OUR SPECIFIC ROLE. 23 24 OUR PURPOSE IN BUYING PLAYGROUND MATS, IT IS A LEGITIMATE PURPOSE, IS TO DO DEMONSTRATIONS TO 25

1 SHOW THAT IT CAN BE DONE, BUT ULTIMATELY TO ENCOURAGE OTHER PEOPLE TO DO THAT. IT'S NOT OUR 2 3 ROLE TO BE IN THAT BUSINESS OF PROVIDING THAT. 4 I THINK WE'VE ALREADY TAKEN A NUMBER 5 OF STEPS IN PREVIOUS YEARS IN THAT REGARD. 6 THIS SPECIFIC ITEM, ANOTHER CONCERN, BECAUSE THE WAY IT'S WRITTEN, IT'S LIMITED TO A PARTICULAR 7 8 TYPE OF MAT WHERE THERE ARE OTHER SOLUTIONS THAT USE GROUND RUBBER ALSO, AS WELL AS MOLDED MATS. 9 10 AND THIS ONE WE'VE GENERALLY BEEN LOOKING AT 11 MOLDED MATS, BUT CRUMB RUBBER IS USED IN PLACE OF 12 SAND AND OTHER THINGS IN PLAYGROUNDS ALSO. SO I THINK WE'RE BEING OVERLY RESTRICTIVE IN THAT 13 14 PARTICULAR AREA. 15 GOING BACK TO THE ASPHALT PAVING, I THINK, YOU KNOW, IF YOU ARE GOING TO DO THAT ONE, 16 17 THE MATCHING GRANT AND THE PROPOSAL THAT MR. 18 CHESBRO HAS PRESENTED TO US IS, WHEREVER IT IS, IS 19 A GOOD ONE. THE ONLY THING THAT I CONTINUE TO 20 HARP ON ON THAT ONE IS THAT ANY MONEY WE SPEND ΙN THAT AREA OUGHT TO BE LIMITED TO THE INCREMENTAL 21 COST OF CRUMB RUBBER PAVING OVER STANDARD 22 PAVING.

23			BOAI	RD M	IEMBEF	R CI	HESBF	20:	THAT	'S	Α	CON	ICEPT
I													
24	STARI	ED I	WITH	BEC.	AUSE	I G	ENER	ALLY	AGRE	ĒΕ	WI	ТН	YOU,
25	THAT	THE	PURI	POSE	HERE	E I	S TO	DEMO	NSTR	ΑT	Έ	AND)
CREATE													

1 ENOUGH INCENTIVE SO THERE'D BE SOME DEMONSTRATIONS. THE PROBLEM, I GUESS, THAT I 2 3 UNDERSTAND THE ADVISORS HAD IN TALKING THIS OVER 4 AND TRYING TO PIN IT DOWN WAS THAT WE WERE GOING 5 TO GET INTO A DETAILED ANALYSIS IN EACH CASE ABOUT б TRYING TO FIGURE OUT WHAT THEIR ACTUAL INCREMENTAL 7 DIFFERENCE WAS, AND THERE SEEMED TO BE A SENSE 8 THAT TRYING TO FIGURE OUT -- THAT'S WHY I SAID 50-50 WOULD BE A VERY NICE INCENTIVE, BUT 9 10 I'M OPEN TO EXACTLY WHAT THE RATIO WOULD BE, BUT 11 THAT WE SET SOME SORT OF A FAIRLY STANDARD NUMBER, 12 TRY TO ESTIMATE WHAT THAT WOULD BE AND HAVE THAT APPLY TO EVERYBODY INSTEAD OF TRYING TO ANALYZE 13 14 EACH INDIVIDUAL PROJECT TO FIGURE OUT WHAT THE 15 INCREMENT IS, YOU KNOW. DO YOU UNDERSTAND WHAT 16 I'M SAYING? 17 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I THINK THE 18 APPLICANTS CAN PROVIDE THAT INFORMATION IN THEIR 19 APPLICATION. 20 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WELL, THE THOUGHT 21 HERE WAS RATHER THAN HAVING IT BE A COMPETITIVE 22 APPLICATION FOR A SUBSIDY, LIKE WE'VE HAD IN THE 23 PAST, THAT WE HAVE MORE OF A CONSCIOUS BOARD AND 24 STAFF DRIVEN DECISION-MAKING PROCESS LIKE WITH

THE

25 COMPOST DEMONSTRATIONS, WHERE WE LOOK AROUND ABOUT

- 1 WHERE THE GAPS ARE IN THE STATE GEOGRAPHICALLY THAT THERE'S A NEED FOR US TO BE FOR US TO HAVE 2 3 SOME PROJECTS. 4 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: BUT FOR 5 DEMONSTRATION PURPOSES ONLY. 6 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: RIGHT. RIGHT. 7 BUT NOT HAVE IT BE, YOU KNOW, 500 LOCAL 8 GOVERNMENTS APPLYING FOR FOUR PROJECTS AND TRYING TO SORT THROUGH ALL THOSE APPLICATIONS AND COMPARE 9 10 THEM, RATHER TO TRY TO PROACTIVELY IN ADVANCE 11 DECIDE WHAT PARTS OF THE STATE WE WANT TO WORK IN 12 AND TRY TO RECRUIT SOME PROJECTS IN THOSE AREAS SIMILAR TO WHAT WE'VE DONE, ESPECIALLY WITH THE 13 14 MOST RECENT THREE COMPOST PROJECTS. 15 IT'S MORE FOCUSED, MORE TARGETED ON AN EXACT PROBLEM WE'RE TRYING TO SOLVE IN A 16 17 CERTAIN REGION OF THE STATE RATHER THAN IT BEING FOCUSED ON THE -- UNNECESSARILY BEING AN INCENTIVE 18 FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT. IF WE WERE PUTTING A LOT OF 19 20 MONEY INTO IT, THEN I THINK IF WE WERE PUTTING 21 ENOUGH FOR 50 PROJECTS HERE OR SOMETHING INTO IT, 22 I THINK GETTING INTO THAT INCREMENTAL THING AND 23 TRYING TO ANALYZE COMPETITIVELY THE
- 24 I THINK, WOULD MAKE SENSE.

APPLICATIONS,

25 OF A WHAT I SEE HERE IS MUCH MORE

- 1 PILOT PROJECT THAT HAS A PURPOSE, A REGIONAL PURPOSE, NOT JUST TRYING TO SOLVE THAT LOCAL 2 3 GOVERNMENT'S PAVING PROBLEM OR GIVE THEM A 4 SUBSIDY, BUT RATHER TRYING TO MAKE SURE THAT SOME 5 REGIONS OF THE STATE THAT HAVEN'T HAD MUCH IN THE б WAY OF DEMONSTRATIONS GET A PROJECT THAT A PUBLIC 7 WORKS DIRECTOR OR A PAVING, WHOEVER IS IN CHARGE 8 OF THAT, CAN GO OVER, TOUCH IT, LOOK AT IT, TALK 9 TO THE STAFF, AND ONE OF THE OBLIGATIONS OF THAT 10 JURISDICTION WOULD BE TO FACILITATE THAT, YOU 11 KNOW, TO BE OPEN TO MEETING ON A REGULAR BASIS 12 WITH THEIR NEIGHBORING -- WE COULD HAVE PAVING 13 FIELD DAY. 14 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I THINK THAT'S A 15 GIANT STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION BECAUSE MY FEAR 16 WITH SOME OF THESE OTHER PROJECTS IS ALL WE DID 17 WAS SUBSIDIZE SOMEONE'S OVERLAY --18 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AND I AGREE WITH 19 YOU. 20 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: -- TO A MUCH 21 GREATER EXTENT THAN THE ACTUAL COST OF THE CRUMB 22 RUBBER OVER OTHER COSTS. SO, YOU KNOW, I WOULD
- LET ME COVER ONE OTHER SUBJECT HERE
 AND THAT'S THE RESERVE AMOUNT. IS IT THE INTENT

AGREE WITH THAT POINT.

1 OR ARE WE GOING TO PUT IN POLICY WHERE THAT MONEY WILL BE USED IF IT IS -- OR WHAT THE RESTRICTIONS 2 3 ARE ON THAT MONEY IF, AND YOU SUGGESTED APRIL OR 4 AT SOME POINT DURING THE FISCAL YEAR, THAT WE --5 THE EMERGENCY HAS NOT AT THAT POINT ARISEN. AND I б JUST WANT TO COME DOWN ON THE SIDE OF RESTRICTING 7 THAT GOING INTO FURTHER REMEDIATION OF THE LEGACY 8 TIRE PILES. THAT'S WHY WE'RE PUTTING IT IN A RESERVE FOR IS IN CASE WE HAVE A FIRE OR WE HAVE 9 10 SOME OTHER EMERGENCY SITUATION. 11 WE DID STRIKE OUT AND THERE'S NO 12 FUNDING FOR THE ITEM ON THE CHART, EMERGENCY FUNDS, SO THAT'S REALLY WHAT THIS BECOMES. AND I 13 14 THINK THAT'S WHERE IT OUGHT TO BE USED, BUT LET'S 15 NOT GET CAUGHT IN THE SITUATION WHERE THAT MONEY 16 ESCAPES US DURING THE FISCAL YEAR, AND IT HAS TO ROLL AGAIN INTO ANOTHER YEAR AND WE HAD TO MOVE. 17 18 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I THINK THAT'S WHAT I WAS SUGGESTING WAS THAT IF BY PROBABLY -- APRIL 19 20 PROBABLY BE ABOUT THE LATEST WE COULD GO WITHOUT 21 MAKING SOME DECISIONS AS TO WHAT TO DO IF WE HAVE 22 NOT USED THAT IN EITHER THE SITUATION THAT IS 23 POSSIBLE TO OCCUR WITH THE OXFORD THING OR A FIRE 2.4 OR SOME OTHER HEALTH AND SAFETY RELATED CLEANUP

SITUATION, THEN WHEN WE GET TO THAT POINT, THEN

THE BOARD CAN DECIDE.

1

25

2 I, OF COURSE, WOULD BE IN FAVOR OF 3 USING IT TO CLEAN UP LEGACY PILES OR THAT SORT OF 4 THING, BUT I WOULDN'T -- I WOULDN'T CLOSE THE DOOR 5 ON PERHAPS ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO SOME OTHER б PROJECTS THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT TODAY. 7 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE 8 NUMBERS THAT THE COMMITTEE ADOPTED, AS I UNDERSTOOD IT FROM THE CHART, INCLUDED RANGES 9 10 THAT -- THE WAY THEY WERE DESCRIBED TO ME WAS THAT 11 THE LOWER NUMBER WAS THE AMOUNT THAT WOULD BE 12 FUNDED NOW AND THAT THERE WOULD BE THE POTENTIAL FOR AUGMENTATION LATER ON INCLUDING THE 13 14 POSSIBILITY OF THIS MONEY LATE IN THE YEAR IF IT 15 WAS GOING TO NOT BE AVAILABLE FOR FUNDING. AND I 16 WOULD JUST LIKE TO MAKE THE PITCH FOR A BALANCED 17 APPROACH BETWEEN MARKETS AND REMEDIATION BY SAYING 18 THAT CLEANING UP PILES WITHOUT PRIMING THE PUMP FOR MARKETS IS A CIRCULAR AND USELESS ACTIVITY, 19 20 THAT WE HAVE TO CONTINUE TO TRY TO FIND A BALANCED 21 PROGRAM. 22 ONE OF THE REASONS WE'RE EVEN HAVING 23 TO HAVE THIS ARGUMENT IS BECAUSE, AS I SAID THIS 2.4 MORNING, IN MANY PEOPLE'S VIEW 25 CENTS IS A

PALTRY SUM, AND IT'S TOUGH TRYING TO FIGURE OUT

- 1 WHAT'S MORE IMPORTANT WHEN THEY'RE BOTH VERY IMPORTANT. AND I THINK -- SO WE CAN HAVE THIS 2 3 ARGUMENT AND THE REAL ISSUE IS THERE'S NOT ENOUGH 4 MONEY TO ADEQUATELY DO EITHER. BUT I REALLY THINK 5 THAT WE NEED TO NOT -- WE NEED TO CONTINUE TO TRY б TO HAVE A BALANCED PROGRAM THAT SAYS ON ONE HAND 7 WE'RE TRYING TO CLEAN UP AND ON THE OTHER HAND 8 WE'RE TRYING TO STIMULATE THE MARKETPLACE PERHAPS 9 IN A MORE TARGETED WAY. 10 AND AS I SAID EARLIER, I AGREE WITH 11 MANY OF YOUR CRITICISMS OF HOW WE'VE APPLIED THESE 12 MONIES IN THE PAST, MR. FRAZEE, IN TERMS OF WHETHER THEY ACTUALLY EFFECTIVELY STIMULATED THE 13 14 MARKET OR DONE OTHER THINGS. BUT I DO THINK THAT 15 I'M VERY CONCERNED. I BECOME EVEN MORE CONCERNED 16 ABOUT THE SIZE OF THE RESERVE AND ITS LACK OF 17 FOCUS IF WE MAKE A DECISION THAT -- AT THIS POINT THAT IT'S GOING TO GO FOR EITHER EXCLUSIVELY OR IN 18 19 SOME IMBALANCED WAY FOR JUST THE CLEANUP AND NOT 20 FOR SOME OF THESE OTHER PROJECTS. 21 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR. 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: STAFF WANTED TO SAY
- MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT, AND THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT I

23

SOMETHING.

BELIEVE WE RAISED IN COMMITTEE, I BELIEVE, IN THE

1

25

MONTH OF OCTOBER. THERE IS A STAFF RESOURCE 2 3 QUESTION HERE. TAKING THE PLAYGROUND MAT EXAMPLE 4 ALONE, I THINK THE AVERAGE COST THAT WE ESTIMATED 5 PER GRANT, IF YOU ASSUMED A 50-50 MATCH, WOULD BE б \$5,000 PER GRANT. AND AT A \$250,000 LEVEL, YOU 7 WOULD BE LOOKING AT 50 GRANTS. 8 IN ADDING IN ANOTHER GRANT COMPONENT FOR RUBBERIZED ASPHALT OR ADDING IN ADDITIONAL 9 10 STAFF RESOURCE NEEDS, AND THE COMMENT THAT I MADE 11 AT COMMITTEE IS WE ARE IN THE PROCESS, WE JUST 12 ENTERED INTO THE STANDARD AGREEMENTS FOR THE '95-6 GRANTS. WE HAVE A SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT REQUIREMENT 13 14 THAT WAS MANDATED THROUGH THE BUDGET BILL, WHICH 15 WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING, EVALUATING ALL OUR PAST GRANTS. AND I MAY HAVE A RESOURCE 16 17 ISSUE WITH ADDITIONAL GRANT PROGRAMS IN HERE AND ADDITIONAL DOLLARS THAT MAY PRECLUDE ME FROM 18 19 GETTING ALL THAT MONEY OUT THE DOOR BY THE END OF 20 THIS FISCAL YEAR. 21 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I JUST WANTED TO 22 CARRY ON WITH THE POINT HERE AND GOING TO THE NEXT 23 STEP. THE RANGE ISSUE, FOR EXAMPLE, IN CLEANUP, I 2.4 DON'T KNOW THAT WE HAVE COME TO A CONCLUSION OF

HOW THOSE CLEANUP CONTRACTS ARE GOING TO BE BID

1 THIS YEAR OR WHETHER A MASTER CONTRACT OR WHETHER -- AND THIS GETS TO STAFF RESOURCES THAT 2 3 CAREN JUST BROUGHT UP TOO. AS I HEARD DISCUSSED, 4 IF WE ARE GOING TO GO INTO A SITUATION WHERE WE'RE 5 GOING TO SEPARATELY BID EVERY PILE, AND I DON'T 6 KNOW IF THAT'S WHERE WE'RE HEADED OR NOT, THAT 7 INVOLVES A LOT OF STAFF RESOURCES ALSO. OR ARE WE 8 GOING INTO A SITUATION OF A MASTER CONTRACT THAT WE'VE HAD IN THE PAST? AND IF WE'RE DOING THAT, 9 10 THEN IS THAT GOING TO BE -- IS THAT BID -- AND I 11 UNDERSTAND THERE'S SOME ADVANTAGES TO BIDDING ON A 12 HIGHER AMOUNT -- IS THAT BID GOING TO BE FOR THE 13 RANGE OR FOR THE GUARANTEED AMOUNT? 14 MS. RICE: WE WERE SUGGESTING IN THE ITEM 15 FOR A RANGE TO ACCOMMODATE THE POTENTIAL THAT NOT 16 ALL FUNDS ALLOCATED FOR DIFFERENT PURPOSES WOULD 17 BE USED AND THAT WE WOULD RETURN TO THE BOARD FOR 18 DIRECTION ON WHETHER THOSE MONIES COULD BE ADDED TO EITHER THE CLEANUP CONTRACT OR ANY OTHER MATTER 19 20 THAT YOU WANTED TO ADD THEM TO, BE IT A GRANT SOLICITATION OR WHATEVER, BUT WE WERE TRYING TO 21 22 PROVIDE THAT RANGE JUST TO HAVE FLEXIBILITY DOWN 23 THE ROAD WITHOUT DOING A NEW RFO OR WHATEVER IT 24 MIGHT BE TO ENCUMBER ADDITIONAL MONEY. 25 ON THE QUESTION OF THE MASTER

1 SERVICES CONTRACT VERSUS INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTING FOR CLEANUPS, I WOULD CERTAINLY RECOMMEND AGAINST 2 3 INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTS FOR CLEANUPS, BOTH FOR STAFF 4 RESOURCE ISSUES AND TIMING ISSUES. IT'S A TIMELY 5 PROCESS TO DO ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS. б I WOULD HOPE THAT WE COULD CONTINUE 7 TO WORK WITH BOARD MEMBER OFFICES ON A WAY TO DO 8 THE CONTRACTING FOR THE UPCOMING CLEANUP CONTRACT WHERE WE TRY TO BUILD IN AS MUCH COMPETITIVENESS 9 10 AS POSSIBLE WITHIN THE SCOPE OF A CONTRACTING. I 11 THINK THERE ARE WAYS TO DO THAT, EVEN USING A 12 MASTER SERVICES CONTRACT. WE'VE CERTAINLY TRIED OUR BEST TO DO 13 14 THAT WITH THE CURRENT CONTRACT WHICH WE HAVE WHERE 15 WE GET, YOU KNOW, IN THE RANGE OF FIVE BIDS FOR EACH CLEANUP, AND IT HAS BEEN A VERY COMPETITIVE 16 17 PROCESS. AND WE CAN CERTAINLY LOOK AT WAYS OF 18 MAKING IT EVEN MORE SO. SO THOSE ARE JUST SOME 19 THOUGHTS ON CONTRACTING. 20 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D 21 BE A WHOLE LOT MORE COMFORTABLE WITH MS. 22 TRGOVCICH'S COMMENTS IF THERE WAS A SIMILAR SENSE 23 THAT, GEE, IF WE DO TOO MUCH CLEANUP, THAT IT'S 2.4 TOO MUCH STAFF WORK. I THINK WE HAVE TO MAKE

PRIORITY DECISIONS HERE. AND IF THE ISSUE IS

- 1 EFFICIENT USE OF STAFF, THEN WE HAVE TO ADDRESS HOW WE DO IT, NOT WHAT THE PRIORITIES ARE, YOU 2 3 KNOW. I MEAN IF YOUR CONCERN IS, GEE, A LOT OF 4 COMPETITIVE CONTRACTING AND BID PROCESSES TAKE A 5 LOT OF STAFF TIME, THEN LET'S TRY TO FIGURE OUT б HOW TO STRUCTURE GETTING THIS MONEY OUT SO THAT WE 7 MINIMIZE THAT. 8 I'M TEMPTED WITH THIS IDEA OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AS OPPOSED TO COMPETITIVE 9 10 GRANTS, YOU KNOW, TO NARROW IT AND HAVE SOME 11 PRIORITY DECISIONS MADE EARLY ON BY THE STAFF 12 ABOUT WHAT ITS PRIORITIES ARE, PICK THE REGIONS OF THE STATE, BE MUCH MORE FOCUSED IN THE SELECTION 13 14 PROCESS RATHER THAN ASKING FOR HOWEVER MANY 15 APPLICATIONS COME IN AND HAVING HUGE AMOUNTS OF STAFF TIME SPENT SORTING THROUGH APPLICATIONS. 16 17 AND I THINK IF STAFF RESOURCES IS 18 THE PROBLEM, THEN YOU COULD ADDRESS -- I HAVEN'T TALKED TO MS. GOTCH ABOUT THIS -- BUT YOU COULD 19 ADDRESS THE PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT THING SIMILARLY 20 2.1 ABOUT HOW DO YOU TARGET THE RESOURCES AND MINIMIZE 22 THE AMOUNT OF STAFF RESOURCES USED.
- 23 ISSUE WITH STAFF, NOT WHETHER WE SPEND IT

THAT'S THE

ON

24 MARKETS OR WHETHER WE SPEND IT ON

REMEDIATION, IN
25 MY ESTIMATION. IT'S HOW WE DO IT, NOT WHAT WE DO.

1 I THINK IT'S UP TO THE BOARD TO DECIDE ITS PRIORITIES IN TERMS OF WHAT THE AREAS OF 2 3 ALLOCATION ARE THAT NEED TO BE APPLIED. 4 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MR. RELIS. 5 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: SPEAKING TO 6 PRIORITIES, I'LL NOW GET TO ADD MY TWO CENTS TO 7 THIS DISCUSSION. FIRST, AS A BROADER MATTER, THE 8 POLICY MATTER, I THOUGHT WE HAD RESOLVED THE ISSUE OF HOW TO GENERALLY SPLIT THE MONEY 50-50 BECAUSE 9 10 50 MARKETS, 50 -- ON THE ASSUMPTION, AND THAT WAS 11 BASED ON THE TESTIMONY, IT'S IN THE POLICY 12 STATEMENT THAT WITHOUT MARKETS, WE'RE NOT GOING TO 13 REALLY SUSTAIN A CLEANUP EFFORT. SO I JUST WANTED 14 TO OFFER THAT. 15 NOW SPEAKING TO SOME OF THE MATTERS 16 OF HOW WE GET TO THE BOTTOM OF THE EXPENDITURES, 17 WHAT PERSUADED ME ABOUT THE L.A. PRESENTATION 18 INITIALLY, WE'LL CALL IT, WAS THE AMOUNT OF TIRES 19 POTENTIALLY DIVERTED THROUGH A SYSTEM OF NOT SO 20 MUCH DEMONSTRATION BECAUSE L.A. COUNTY DOES IT, 21 ACCORDING TO WHAT I'VE BEEN TOLD, WHAT THE 22 PRESENTATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN MADE, THEY'RE NOT AT 23 THE DEMONSTRATION PHASE. THEY'RE LAYING DOWN 2.4 MILES AND MILES OF TIRES.

NOW, SPEAKING TO WHAT MR. CHESBRO

BROUGHT UP, AND THIS LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, I WONDER IF ANOTHER WAY TO 2 3 LOOK AT THIS WOULD BE TO -- YOU'RE CONCERNED ABOUT 4 GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION, AND WE DEALT WITH THAT IN 5 THE AGRICULTURAL DEMONSTRATION COMPOST. YOU'RE RIGHT ON THAT. MY SENSE IS THAT -- AND I WOULD BE б 7 INTERESTED TO HEAR WHEN THE TESTIMONY COMES FROM THE FOLKS DOWN SOUTH. SUPPOSE THAT MONIES WERE 8 CONCENTRATED IN THAT PLACE, BUT YOU'RE PROVIDING 9 10 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE STATEWIDE. THIS IS NOT -- I 11 DON'T VIEW THIS AS A SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PROJECT. 12 I VIEW IT AS A STATEWIDE PROJECT. 13 AND THE ISSUE SEEMS TO ME NOT SO 14 MUCH -- YOU MIGHT THINK IT'S DEMONSTRATION, BUT 15 IT'S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO GET BEYOND 16 DEMONSTRATION BECAUSE IF THEY'RE RIGHT, AND THEY'RE SAYING THAT THEY'RE LAYING DOWN TIRES OR 17 18 CRUMB RUBBER AT A SAVINGS OF \$60,000 A PAVED MILE, 19 THAT'S NOT AN ISSUE OF -- THAT DOESN'T EVEN 20 REQUIRE AN INCENTIVE. YOU WOULD BE STUPID IF YOU 21 DIDN'T DO IT, IF YOU ARE A PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR, 22 IF THAT WAS, IN FACT, THE CASE BECAUSE YOU'RE SAVING THE PUBLIC, YOU'RE LAYING DOWN MORE 23 24 MILEAGE. SO IF THERE WOULD BE -- IF MR. CHESBRO

1 CONTRACT COULD BE FOCUSED TO ASSURE THAT THE DISTRIBUTION ISSUE WAS ADDRESSED. 2 3 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I'M CONVINCED, IF 4 I MAY, THAT THE INTENTION OF THE CENTER IS TO BE 5 STATEWIDE. THE REASON WHY I DON'T SEE IT AS 6 COMPLETELY FULFILLING THAT IS THAT SOUTHERN 7 CALIFORNIA, THEY HAVE DEMONSTRATIONS, THEY'VE GOT 8 THE PAVEMENT IN PLACE. AND SO PEOPLE HAVE OPPORTUNITIES NOW TO DO THE FIRST WADING OUT INTO 9 10 THE ISSUE BY GOING AND LOOKING AND TALKING TO 11 SOMEBODY PRETTY CONVENIENTLY JUST ABOUT ANYWHERE 12 IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. THEY'RE READY FOR THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IS WHAT I'M SAYING. IT'S HIT 13 14 THE POINT OF COST-EFFECTIVENESS, DEMONSTRATION, 15 ALL THOSE THINGS HAVE HAPPENED. THOSE THINGS 16 HAVEN'T HAPPENED EVERYWHERE IN THE STATE. 17 SO I'M SAYING IS THAT I DON'T KNOW 18 THAT THOSE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS ARE GOING TO BE READY TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF AND BE EDUCATED 19 ENOUGH 2.0 TO WANT TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE SOUTHERN 21 CALIFORNIA CENTER'S SERVICES IF THEY DON'T HAVE ΙN 22 THEIR REGION SOMEPLACE THAT THEY CAN SEE THE STUFF

23	BEING	DEMON	ISTI	RATED.	AND) I	THI	INK	THAT	WE'VE	GOI
AN											
	INEQUA GEOGRA			WHERE	THE	ISS	SUE	HAS	DEVI	ELOPED	

1 AND SO I THINK WE NEED TO DO A LITTLE BIT OF REMEDIAL WORK ELSEWHERE OUTSIDE OF 2 3 L.A. AND ORANGE COUNTY TO HELP THEM GET TO THE 4 POINT THAT THERE ARE GOING TO BE PEOPLE MORE 5 INTERESTED IN TAKING ADVANTAGE OF WHAT THE б SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CENTER HAS TO OFFER. AGAIN, 7 THOSE FIELD DAYS YOU'VE BEEN TO, PAUL, YOU KNOW 8 THAT THE FARMER JUST COMING DOWN, TALKING TO THE OTHER FARMER AND SEEING IT IS THE FIRST STEP. AND 9 10 THEN, YOU KNOW, YOU CAN START EDUCATING THEM ABOUT 11 HOW THEY MIGHT USE IT, BUT THEY HAVE TO HAVE THAT 12 FIRST BLUSH. AND I THINK WE'RE AT THAT POINT IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. I'M NOT CONVINCED THAT WE'RE 13 14 AT THAT POINT EVERYWHERE IN THE STATE. IN FACT, 15 I'M CONVINCED THAT WE'RE NOT IN MANY PLACES. SO I GUESS THAT'S MY ARGUMENT. 16 17 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: OKAY. IF I COULD 18 JUST GO ON FOR A MOMENT FURTHER. ON THE OUESTION OF THE MATS, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT, YOU KNOW, AT 19 20 THIS STAGE WE HAVE -- IN THE MOTION WE HAVE 21 PROPOSED, WHAT, 250 FOR THE MATS. IT'S A SIZABLE 22 NUMBER. WE HAVE SPENT 269,000 OR THEREABOUTS 23 HISTORICALLY ON MATS. I MIGHT BE PERSUADED TO DO 2.4 MORE DOWN THE LINE ON MATS IF WE CAN SEE THAT

WE'RE HAVING A NUMERICAL, A SUBSTANTIAL NUMERICAL

1 IMPACT ON THE TIRE PROBLEM BECAUSE FUNDAMENTALLY THAT'S MY BOTTOM LINE CONCERN. HOW DO WE TAKE A 2 3 LIMITED NUMBER OF -- VERY LIMITED NUMBER OF 4 DOLLARS AND HAVE THE MAXIMUM IMPACT ON HEALTH AND 5 SAFETY AND ON DIVERTING THESE TIRES FROM TIRE б PILES AND THE ANNUAL EXCESS. 7 AND RIGHT NOW I'M NOT CONVINCED THAT 8 THERE'S ENOUGH NUMERICAL -- THERE'S NOT A LARGE ENOUGH NUMBER. THERE'S A THEORETICAL NUMBER OF 9 10 3.8 MILLION, I THINK, IF ALL THE SCHOOLS USE THEM 11 AND -- BUT I THINK WE SHOULD GET SOME MORE 12 EXPERIENCE WITH IT. AND I THINK 200,000 WOULD GIVE US ENOUGH TO GET THAT EXPERIENCE. 13 14 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: MAY I ADDRESS THAT? 15 I DON'T KNOW IF YOU -- I'D LIKE TO ASK IF MY 16 COLLEAGUES HAD A CHANCE TO READ THE WHITE PAPER 17 THAT I PUT OUT. THIS ADDRESSES, ONE, IS THE SAFETY TO KIDS. THEY'RE -- 90 PERCENT OF 18 19 CALIFORNIA PLAYGROUNDS LACK THE PROTECTIVE 20 SURFACING. BUT THEN THE WASTE DIVERSION, YOU HAD 21 MENTIONED THAT 3.7 MILLION TIRES THAT WE ARE AWARE 22 OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, BUT ADDITIONALLY 23 THERE ARE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, DAY 2.4 CARE CENTERS ALL WITH DIFFERENT PLAYGROUNDS THAT

NEED PROTECTIVE SURFACING, SO THAT NUMBER COULD BE

- 1 THREE TO FOUR TIMES HIGHER.
- 2 AND THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT ASPECT OF
- 3 IT, WHICH THIS CREATES TREMENDOUS MARKET
- 4 DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR BUSINESSES THAT ARE
- 5 EXISTING AND FOR NEW BUSINESSES, AND THE PUBLIC
- 6 EDUCATION AND THE PARTNERSHIP POTENTIAL.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I DON'T DISPUTE THE
- 8 POSSIBILITY, BUT I THINK THAT'S VERY MUCH A
- 9 THEORETICAL NUMBER AT THIS POINT. NOW, YOU COULD
- 10 SAY THAT'S TRUE IN CRUMB RUBBER AS WELL, BUT WE
- 11 HAVE LOTS OF MILES BEING LAID HERE. AND I'M NOT
- 12 SAYING -- THIS ISN'T AN ALL OR NOTHING. WE'RE
- 13 STILL TALKING ABOUT \$250,000 GOING TO THE PROGRAM.
- 14 SO...
- BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AND THE PRUDENT
- 16 RESERVE IS ALSO AN ARBITRARY NUMBER THAT'S THROWN
- 17 OUT THERE ALSO. SO...
- 18 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. LET'S HEAR
- 19 FROM THE PUBLIC A LITTLE BIT. MICHAEL BYRNE.
- MR. BYRNE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
- 21 MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. BACK IN THE EARLY '80S,
- 22 I WAS A BUDGET ANALYST AT THE DEPARTMENT OF
- 23 FINANCE. IN FACT, ONE OF MY BUDGETS WAS THE THEN
- 24 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD WITH ITS 65
- 25 EMPLOYEES, AND A PART OF THAT JOB YOU HAVE TO

1 TESTIFY BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE. AND I HAD A VERY 2 SAGE PRINCIPAL ANALYST THAT SAID IF YOU'RE LOSING, 3 KEEP TALKING. IF YOU'RE WINNING, SIT DOWN AND SHUT UP. AT THIS POINT IN TIME, I DON'T KNOW IF I 4 SHOULD KEEP TALKING OR SIT DOWN. 5 6 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I DON'T EITHER. 7 MR. BYRNE: LET ME MAKE A FEW COMMENTS. 8 THE PROPOSAL FROM OXFORD AND FROM MELP IS VERY 9 TIME SENSITIVE. IF WE DON'T GET SOMETHING TOGETHER BY JANUARY OR FEBRUARY, YOU KNOW, I WOULD 10 SAY THAT THERE'S REALLY NO NEED TO DO IT BECAUSE 11 IT'S ALL BASED UPON THAT CLIFF DATE THAT SITS OUT 12 13 THERE IN SEPTEMBER OF '97. 14 NOW, MELP AND OXFORD, WE'VE GOT LOTS 15 OF PROBLEMS. WE'RE HAVING DIFFICULTY BETWEEN THE TWO ORGANIZATIONS, AND I HOPE THAT WE CAN WORK 16 17 THOSE PROBLEMS OUT. AND IF WE CAN WORK THOSE 18 PROBLEMS OUT, I HOPE WE CAN WORK WITH STAFF AND COME TOGETHER WITH A PROPOSAL. BUT THAT PROPOSAL 19 20 HAS TO BE BEFORE YOU, SAY, IN THE NEXT 60 DAYS OR, LIKE I SAY, IT'S NOT A VALID PROPOSAL ANYMORE. 21 22 NOW, HALF A MILLION DOLLARS WILL 23 TAKE THE PILE OF 6.5 MILLION TIRES THAT IS

REOUIRED BY THE PERMIT ON MAY 1 AND REDUCE THAT BY

THREE MILLION TIRES, WHICH IS QUITE A SUBSTANTIAL

24

1 REDUCTION. IN FACT, LIKE I SAID TO THE BOARD 2 BEFORE, THE CALIFORNIANS AGAINST WASTE WERE VERY 3 SUPPORTIVE OF THE PROPOSAL PRIMARILY FOR THAT REASON. FOR VERY LITTLE MONEY, YOU CAN GET A VERY 4 5 BIG REDUCTION IN THE PROBLEM OUT THERE IN WESTLEY. 6 SO I WOULD RECOMMEND LEAVING THE \$500,000 IN THERE 7 AS A PRUDENT RESERVE, SEE IF WE CAN WORK SOMETHING 8 OUT. IF WE CAN'T, YOU WILL KNOW VERY SOON. 9 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: QUESTIONS OF MR. BYRNE? THANK YOU. NEXT WE HAVE DONNA CARLSON. 10 11 MS. CARLSON: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, AND GOOD AFTERNOON TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. 12 13 I'M THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE RUBBER PAVEMENTS ASSOCIATION, AND WE ARE CURRENTLY BASED IN TEMPE, 14 15 ARIZONA. WE HAVE BEEN IN WASHINGTON, D.C., FOR 16 ABOUT FOUR YEARS, AND OUR ASSOCIATION HAS 17 COMPLETED ITS TASK IN WASHINGTON, D.C., AND IS MOM 18 BACK IN THE WEST COAST PRIMARILY TO PROVIDE AN 19 OUTREACH PROGRAM TO STIMULATE THE MARKET OF CRUMB 20 RUBBER MODIFIED ASPHALTS. 21 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE DID IN

WASHINGTON, D.C., OTHER THAN BEING THE SUBJECT OF

A MANDATE IN THE ISTEA LEGISLATION, WAS TO LOBBY

22

24	FOR 1	FEDEF	RAL F	RESEARCH	MON	IEY	, AND	THAT	RES	SEARCH	IS
25	TAKII	NG PI	LACE .	. THERE	IS	Α	WHOLE	BODY	OF	FEDERA	λL

1 RESEARCH THAT IS NOW NEAR COMPLETION, AND WE WILL BE TAKING THAT AND PROVIDING THAT TECHNICAL 2 3 ASSISTANCE TO STATE AGENCIES AND LOCAL AGENCIES 4 THROUGHOUT THE WESTERN UNITED STATES AND 5 THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, IN FACT. 6 THE REASON I AM HERE IS YOUR 7 PROPOSAL FOR A STATEWIDE CENTER FOR TECHNICAL 8 ASSISTANCE. WE ARE VERY INTERESTED IN THIS, AND WE COMMEND YOU FOR GIVING THOUGHT AND CONSIDERA-9 10 TION TO THIS TYPE OF OUTREACH THAT WILL INCREASE 11 THE MARKET HERE IN CALIFORNIA. I'M SURE YOU ARE AWARE THAT CALIFORNIA IS ONE OF THE LEADING USERS 12 OF CRUMB RUBBER MODIFIED ASPHALTS, AND THE MARKET 13 14 IS GROWING. AND WE'RE VERY INTERESTED IN SEEING 15 THAT THAT GROWTH CONTINUES. 16 MY BOARD OF DIRECTORS HAS A LARGE 17 NUMBER OF CALIFORNIA FIRMS. IN FACT, MOST OF THE INDUSTRY HERE IN CALIFORNIA ARE MEMBERS OF MY 18 BOARD OF DIRECTORS. SO WE'RE VITALLY INTERESTED 19 20 IN SEEING WHAT KIND OF A PROGRAM IS GOING TO BE PUT TOGETHER AND WHAT WE CAN DO TO HELP YOU PUT 21 22 THAT OUTREACH PROGRAM TOGETHER BECAUSE WE HAVE AT 23 OUR DISPOSAL AND WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE PURPOSE 2.4 OF OUR ASSOCIATION THE MEANS OF HELPING TO 25 TRANSFER TECHNOLOGY TO AGENCIES WHO ARE NOT

FAMILIAR WITH THE USE OF THIS PRODUCT. 1 2 SO WE'RE VERY INTERESTED IN WORKING 3 WITH YOU TO DEVELOP A PROGRAM. WE WOULD LIKE TO 4 SEE WHAT SUCH A PROGRAM IS GOING TO INVOLVE. 5 I MUST APOLOGIZE THAT I HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO б CONTACT THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD SOONER. 7 HAD SOME LIMITED CONTACT WITH SOME STAFF MEMBERS, 8 AND I JUST LEARNED OF THIS PROPOSAL ON THE 13TH OF 9 NOVEMBER, SO I HAVEN'T HAD A LOT OF TIME. 10 I DID VISIT THE COUNTY OF LOS 11 ANGELES TO TRY AND GET A FEEL FROM THEM AS TO THE 12 TYPE OF PROGRAM THEY WERE GOING TO PUT TOGETHER TO TAKE THE TECHNOLOGY THAT'S AVAILABLE AND GET IT 13 14 OUT TO THE LOCAL AGENCIES TO STIMULATE THE USE. 15 AND CERTAINLY THEY'RE WELL QUALIFIED TO DO THAT 16 BECAUSE THEY ARE A LONGTIME USER OF THIS PRODUCT AND THEY HAVE HAD A LOT OF EXPERIENCE. 17 18 BUT I DIDN'T COME AWAY WITH A REAL SENSE OF WHAT WAS GOING TO TAKE PLACE. 19 20 THAT, YES, THERE'S A DESIRE ON THE PART OF THE 21 CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD TO DO 22 SOMETHING TO STIMULATE THE MARKET AND, OF COURSE, 23 THAT WILL BENEFIT OUR INDUSTRY AND OUR ASSOCIATION 2.4 IF THIS MARKET CONTINUES TO GROW, BUT I DIDN'T GET A REAL SENSE OF WHAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN, AND

THAT'S WHAT WE WANT TO KNOW.

1

AND WHAT -- IF WE CAN HAVE A PART IN 2 3 PUTTING TOGETHER A PROGRAM THAT WILL ACCOMPLISH 4 YOUR GOALS, WE ARE MORE THAN WILLING TO DO 5 EVERYTHING WE CAN. SO WITH THAT IN MIND, I WOULD б LIKE TO REQUEST THAT YOU PUT THIS OUT AS AN RFP SO 7 SPECIFIC GOALS CAN BE DRAFTED THAT WILL ACCOMPLISH 8 WHAT YOU WANT TO DO. 9 AND WE'LL BE GLAD TO WORK WITH YOU 10 IN WHATEVER FORM IT TAKES, WHETHER IT BE AN AGENCY 11 ONLY THAT CAN SUBMIT TO THE RFP OR WHETHER IT CAN 12 BE A COMBINATION OF AGENCY AND, SAY, A NONPROFIT ASSOCIATION SUCH AS OURS OR PERHAPS A UNIVERSITY, 13 14 BUT A COMBINATION, WHATEVER IT WOULD TAKE TO DO 15 THE JOB AND GET IT DONE WELL. SO WE REALLY WOULD 16 LIKE TO SEE SOMETHING THAT WE CAN SAY, YES, THIS 17 IS GOING TO BE A GREAT PROGRAM AND WE CAN 18 CONTRIBUTE TO THIS. 19 SO WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE YOU PUT OUT 20 AN RFP FOR THIS STATEWIDE CENTER. AND I MIGHT ADD 21 THAT OUR ASSOCIATION IS CURRENTLY A SUBCONTRACTOR 22 ON A GRANT THAT YOU GAVE LAST YEAR TO CAL STATE 23 UNIVERSITY AT SACRAMENTO FOR TWO WORKSHOPS WHICH 2.4 ARE UPCOMING IN MAY. AND WE HAD HOPED TO USE THOSE WORKSHOPS, WHICH ARE BEING GEARED TOWARDS 25

LOCAL AGENCIES, AS A FORUM WHERE WE CAN GET 1 FEEDBACK FROM THOSE AGENCIES ON WHAT DO YOU NEED 2 3 IN THE WAY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND THEN DRAFT 4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR YOU FROM WHAT WE LEARN AT 5 THOSE WORKSHOPS. 6 AND AS WE SPEAK, OUR ASSOCIATION, 7 WHOSE ROLE IN THIS PROGRAM IS TO PROMOTE THE 8 WORKSHOPS AND TO HELP CAL STATE UNIVERSITY PUT TOGETHER A GROUP OF VERY EXPERT TECHNICAL 9 10 SPEAKERS, AS WE SPEAK, I AM HAVING OUR ASSOCIATION 11 NEWSLETTER SENT TO EVERY CITY ENGINEER IN THE 12 STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND EVERY CITY PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS WELL AS 13 14 YOUR COUNTY AGENCIES AND APPROPRIATE AGENCIES THAT 15 WE WOULD NORMALLY MAIL TO ANYHOW AS A MEANS OF 16 PROMOTING THIS WORKSHOP SO WE CAN GAIN THIS 17 VALUABLE FEEDBACK FROM THE PEOPLE WHO ATTEND THE 18 WORKSHOPS. 19 SO WE STAND READY TO ASSIST THIS 20 BOARD IN ANY WAY WE CAN TO PUT TOGETHER A PROGRAM THAT IS A TRUE OUTREACH PROGRAM. AND I WOULD ASK 21 22 YOU TO SERIOUSLY CONSIDER MY REQUEST, THAT THIS BE 23 PUT OUT IN THE FORM OF AN RFP SO YOUR STAFF AND 2.4 YOU CAN CLEARLY DELINEATE WHAT IT IS YOU WANT TO 25 DO AS AN OUTREACH PROGRAM. AND WITH THAT, I WILL

ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU HAVE. 1 2 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY QUESTIONS OF 3 MS. CARLSON? 4 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: JUST TO SAY, MR. 5 CHAIRMAN, I DON'T THINK YOU ARE ALONE IN BELIEVING THAT THIS ITEM NEEDS MORE WORK, BUT I BELIEVE б 7 THAT'S THE POINT THAT WE ARE VISITING RIGHT NOW IS 8 WHETHER OR NOT WE'RE GOING TO BUDGET, AND IT'S PRETTY CONCEPTUAL, I THINK, AT THIS POINT. LOS 9 10 ANGELES COUNTY DID COME TO US WITH A CONCEPT. AND 11 I THINK WE ALL ACCEPTED THAT AS BEING WORTHWHILE. 12 BUT CERTAINLY FOR THIS MEMBER THERE'S A LOT MORE WORK THAT MUST BE DONE BEFORE WE ACTUALLY FUND 13 14 THAT PROPOSAL. SO THIS IS SORT OF A BUDGETING 15 STEP, AND I APPRECIATE YOUR COMMENT AND HOPE YOUR ASSOCIATION WILL BE AN ACTIVE PARTICIPANT IN 16 WHAT 17 EVOLVES FROM THIS. 18 MS. CARLSON: WE CERTAINLY WILL BE AN 19 ACTIVE PARTICIPANT AT WHATEVER FORM THIS TAKES. 20 AND I DO UNDERSTAND THAT YOU ARE JUST ALLOCATING 21 SOME FUNDS. WHAT I'M SAYING IS WE'D LIKE TO SEE THE BOARD TAKE THE NEXT STEP AND DO AN RFP SO WE 22

CAN HAVE CLEAR, DELINEATED GOALS OF THE BOARD

AND

24	THAT WE	CAN PR	OVIDE	ASSISTANCE	IN	WHATEV	/ER	MEANS
25	IN HELP	ING WIT	H THE	OUTREACH.	SO	THANK	YOU	VERY

1 MUCH. 2 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MS. CARLSON, I'M 3 NOT TOO FAMILIAR WITH YOUR ASSOCIATION. WHO ARE THE MEMBERS OF YOUR ASSOCIATION? 4 5 MS. CARLSON: OKAY. WE ARE AN 6 INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION ACTUALLY. WE HAVE 7 MEMBERS OF THE RUBBER PRODUCERS, THE PEOPLE WHO 8 RECYCLE THE SCRAP TIRES. TWO OF OUR MEMBERS ARE 9 SITTING HERE IN THIS ROOM, REPRESENTING BAS AND ATLOS RUBBER. AND WE ALSO HAVE THE CONTRACTORS 10 WHO TAKE THE CRUMB RUBBER AND PUT IT IN ASPHALT AS 11 12 OUR MEMBERS. 13 SO IN CALIFORNIA I WOULD SAY 90 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THIS INDUSTRY 14 15 ARE MEMBERS OF OUR ASSOCIATION, AND YOU HAVE A 16 VAST AMOUNT OF EXPERTISE AND TECHNOLOGY THROUGH 17 THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN OUT THERE IN THE FIELD 18 FOR MANY, MANY YEARS THAT CAN BE VERY HELPFUL IN WHATEVER PROGRAM YOU PUT TOGETHER. 19 20 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU. OKAY. JACK MICHAEL. 21 22 MR. MICHAEL: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. I'M JACK MICHAEL

VERY FEW WORDS TO SAY AT THIS POINT. WE'VE

REPRESENTING LOS ANGELES COUNTY. I CERTAINLY HAVE

23

24

DISCUSSED THIS ON MANY OCCASIONS.

1

2 I WOULD SIMPLY SAY I THINK, BASED ON 3 THE DISCUSSION EARLIER OF COMMITMENT OF STAFF RESOURCES, WE'D CERTAINLY ENCOURAGE INTERAGENCY 4 5 APPROACH ON OUR PROPOSAL. I THINK THAT THE --6 CERTAINLY THE ISSUES RAISED BY MS. CARLSON CAN BE 7 ADDRESSED AS WELL THROUGH THAT PROCESS AS THROUGH 8 AN RFP. HOWEVER, WE STAND READY TO PROCEED 9 HOWEVER THE BOARD CHOOSES AND LOOK FORWARD TO GETTING ON WITH THIS SO THAT WE CAN BEGIN THE REAL 10 PROCESS OF GETTING OTHERS INVOLVED IN PUTTING 11 12 RUBBERIZED ASPHALT ON THE GROUND. I'LL BE 13 AVAILABLE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS. 14 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY QUESTIONS OF MR. MICHAEL? OKAY. THANK YOU. NEXT IS CLIFF 15 16 ASHFORD -- ASHCROFT. 17 MR. ASHCROFT: MR. CHAIRMAN AND LADIES 18 AND GENTLEMEN OF THE BOARD, APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO TALK WITH YOU HERE TODAY. I'M THE 19 20 MARKETING MANAGER FOR THE ASPHALT RUBBER PAVING 21 DIVISION OF MANHOLE ADJUSTING. MANY OF YOU HAVE 22 PROBABLY KNOWN OF US IN TIMES PAST. WE SENT OUT Α 23 NEWS MESSENGER LETTER THAT BESPEAKS OF THE ASPHALT

24	RUBBER	WORK	BEING I	OONE T	HROUGHO	UT	THE	STATE.	. WE
25	HAVE A	DIST	RIBUTION	N OVER	6,000	IN	THE	STATE	OF

1 CALIFORNIA. 2 IN 1992 WE HAD THE PRIVILEGE AND 3 OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE DOWN MEMBERS OF THE BOARD TO ONE OF THE LARGEST PROJECTS THAT WE HAD PROCURED 4 AND DEVELOPED AT THAT TIME, AND THAT WAS THE CITY 5 6 OF THOUSAND OAKS. AT THAT TIME THEY PUT FORTH A 7 53,000 TON PROJECT, WHICH INCORPORATED THE USE OF 8 ROUGHLY A HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND OR THE EQUIVALENT 9 THEREOF OF SCRAP TIRES. VERY LARGE FOR ITS TIME. WE BASED A NEWSLETTER AROUND THAT 10 AND SENT IT TO OVER 6,000 PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE 11 STATE. THE BOTTOM LINE WITH MYSELF IS, AS A 12 13 MARKETING MANAGER FOR THE COMPANY, MY LIVELIHOOD AND THE LIVELIHOOD OF ABOUT 60 EMPLOYEES FOR THE 14 PAST TEN YEARS HAS REVOLVED AROUND THE SUCCESSFUL 15 TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER. I'D LIKE TO CALL IT AN 16 17 EDUCATIONAL CAMPAIGN BECAUSE WHEN WORKING WITH 18 ENGINEERS AND OTHER DECISION MAKERS THAT HANDLE 19 FUNDING, I HAVE FOUND THAT WITH PROPER EDUCATION, 20 THE DECISION IS OFTEN MADE TO GO AHEAD AND PROCEED 21 WITH THE USE OF ASPHALT RUBBER, BUT THERE'S AN 22 EDUCATION PROCESS THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE. 23 WE FEEL BASICALLY THAT WE'VE DONE A 24 VERY SUCCESSFUL JOB, AND THAT CAN BE UNDERSTOOD 25 FROM THE FACT THAT THERE'S A GREAT DEAL OF DEMAND,

1 THERE'S A GREAT DEAL OF CONCERN HERE TODAY, AND A LOT OF INTEREST THAT'S BEING SHOWN WITH RESPECT TO 2 3 THE USE OF ASPHALT RUBBER. 4 IT'S COME TO MY ATTENTION RECENTLY 5 THAT THERE IS AN ONGOING CONSIDERATION FOR FUNDING б WITH RESPECT TO A TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER AND OUTREACH 7 PROGRAM. AND LOS ANGELES COUNTY HAS FOLLOWED 8 THROUGH WITH THAT IN CONJUNCTION WITH TOP (PHONETIC) CONSULTANTS INCORPORATED. THE ATTEMPT 9 10 BEHIND THE FUNDING, I THINK, IS OUTSTANDING, AND I 11 COMMEND THE BOARD AND THE STAFF MEMBERS FOR THEIR 12 UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT'S TAKING PLACE IN THE 13 INDUSTRY. 14 IT'S LIKE THE SNOW BALL IS ROLLING 15 AT THIS POINT, BUT WE NEED TO KEEP IT GOING. AND 16 THE WAY TO DO SO IS THROUGH EDUCATION AND TO HAVE 17 PROPER JOBS GET PLACED DOWN ON THE GROUND. 18 DATE WE HAVE WORKED WITH SEVERAL PROFESSIONALS AND CONSULTANTS IN THE INDUSTRY, CUMULATIVELY HUNDREDS 19 20 OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE THAT WE HAVE REFERENCED 21 THROUGHOUT THE TEN YEARS THAT WE HAVE BEEN WORKING 22 IN THIS INDUSTRY AND PROMOTING IT, PARTICULARLY IN 23 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. WE HAVE A LOT OF EXPERIENCE. 2.4 THERE'S A LOT OF REFERENCE AND A LOT OF RESEARCH

WE HAVE AVAILABLE AT OUR FINGERTIPS.

1	AGAIN, THE INTENT BEHIND THE
2	OUTREACH PROGRAM, I THINK, IS OUTSTANDING AND VERY
3	WELL NEEDED; HOWEVER, HERE'S A CONCERN THAT I
4	HAVE. AS A MARKETING MANAGER OF THIS COMPANY THAT
5	I'M ASSOCIATED WITH AND ONE WHOSE LIVELIHOOD IS
6	DEPENDENT UPON A SUCCESSFUL OUTREACH PROGRAM, I
7	RECOGNIZE THAT SPECIFIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES HAVE
8	TO BE LAID OUT SUCH THAT ONE CAN ANALYZE PROGRESS,
9	CHECK WITH METHODS THAT ARE BEING DONE WITH
10	RESPECT TO OUTREACH, ALTER AND ADJUST THROUGHOUT
11	THE COURSE OF TIME SUCH THAT YOU CAN HAVE THE MOST
12	SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM OR EDUCATION INFORMATION
13	EXCHANGE POSSIBLE. THAT RELATES TO SUCCESS NOT
14	ONLY FOR US, BUT FOR THE INDUSTRY AS A WHOLE.
15	CURRENTLY OF WHAT I KNOW OF THE
16	PROPOSAL OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, I DON'T SEE ANY
17	SPECIFIC GOALS OR SUBGOALS OR OVERALL ACHIEVEMENT
18	GOALS THAT ARE TO BE REACHED. THAT CONCERNS ME.
19	I DON'T SEE A MECHANISM IN PLACE TO CHECK THOSE
20	GOALS AND MAKE CHANGES AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THEM.
21	AS WELL, I FEEL THAT IF THE BOARD WANTED TO GET
22	THE BIGGEST BANG FOR THEIR BUCK, IF THEY PUT IT
23	OUT TO THE PUBLIC INDUSTRY, SUCH THAT ANY
24	INDIVIDUAL SUCH AS OURSELVES WHO HAVE HAD A
DECADE	

SUCCESSFUL OUTREACH PROGRAMS THAT HAVE TAKEN

1

PLACE, THE RUBBER PAVEMENTS ASSOCIATION OR OTHER 2 3 INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE OUT THERE, THEY CAN GO TO THE 4 PRIVATE SECTOR AND HAVE A COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT 5 EXIST. AND TYPICALLY WHEN PEOPLE THAT ARE PLACED 6 IN A COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT, THEY WORK A LITTLE 7 BIT HARDER THAN THEY WOULD RIGHT FROM THE GET-GO 8 BECAUSE BOTTOM LINE TO THEM, THEIR LIVELIHOODS ARE 9 AT STAKE. 10 SO, AGAIN, MY RECOMMENDATION OR AT LEAST CONCERN TOWARDS THE BOARD WOULD BE TO 11 CREATE 12 A COMPETITIVE ENVIRONMENT, TO ESTABLISH CLEAR-CUT 13 GOALS, AND TO ALLOW OTHER EXPERTS IN THE INDUSTRY 14 TO HELP PARTICIPATE AND ACHIEVE THE VERY NOBLE 15 GOALS THAT YOU HAVE SET THAT ARE VERY MUCH REQUIRED AT THIS TIME IN THE GROWTH OF THE 16 ASPHALT 17 RUBBER INDUSTRY. 18 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: POINT OF 19 CLARIFICATION SINCE TWO SPEAKERS HAVE BEEN UP ON THE SUBJECT OF WHAT WOULD BE THE GOALS AND 20 21 OBJECTIVES. I THINK, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, AND,

22	STAFF, COULD CORRECT ME IF I'M ERRING HERE, IF WE
23	DID DO AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT, THE IDEA WAS WE
24	WERE GOING THIS WAS A BOARD DRIVEN PROCESS
WITH 25	GOALS AND OBJECTIVES SPECIFIED BY THE BOARD, NOT

- 1 BY THE RECEIVING PARTY. 2 IN OTHER WORDS, WE KNOW AND WE WILL 3 THRASH THROUGH WHAT WE WANT OUT OF THE CONTRACT, NOT -- THIS ISN'T A PASSIVE RELATIONSHIP FROM OUR 4 5 SIDE. SO I JUST TRY TO ALLEVIATE ANY CONCERNS 6 THAT WE DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT SPECIFIC GOALS, 7 OBJECTIVES, ACCOUNTABILITY WOULD BE FOREMOST IN 8 OUR MINDS. 9 MR. ASHCROFT: CERTAINLY. I APPRECIATE THAT STATEMENT. MY CONCERN IS THAT AT THIS POINT 10 THE MAJOR STEP IS BEING MADE, A VERY GOOD STEP, 11 12 BUT MY CONCERN IS TO GET THE FRAMEWORK 13 ESTABLISHED. AND ME, AS A GENERAL PERSON OF THE PUBLIC, VERY KNOWLEDGEABLE AS FAR AS WORKING WITH 14 LOS ANGELES COUNTY -- THEY'VE DONE AN OUTSTANDING 15 JOB, AND THEY WOULD BE WELL IN PLACE TO CARRY OUT 16 17 WITH THIS -- BUT AGAIN, MY CONCERN WOULD BE IS TO 18 HAVE THE PROPER FRAMEWORK LAID OUT. 19 THE ONLY DOCUMENTS THAT I HAVE BEEN 20 ABLE TO REVIEW DON'T LAY OUT A PROPER FRAMEWORK OR AT LEAST FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, AND AS WELL IT 21
- TO BE NARROWED DOWN AS TO WHO WOULD BE AVAILABLE,
- LET'S SAY, WITH A REFERENCE TO OUTSIDE

SEEMS

24	CONSULTANTS,	INDUSTRY KN	OWLEDGE AND	EXPERIENCE
25	THAT EXISTS.	AND AGAIN,	THAT WOULD	BE A

- 1 CONCERN -- I WOULD -- IF THAT'S GOING TO BE THE
- 2 CASE WHERE THERE IS GOING TO BE A PRIVATE TYPE OF
- 3 CONSIDERATION WITH RESPECT TO PART OF THIS
- 4 FUNDING, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT AVAILABLE TO A
- 5 COMPETITIVE ATMOSPHERE WHERE THE BOARD CAN AGAIN
- 6 GET THE BEST BANG FOR THEIR BUCK.
- 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU.
- 8 ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OF MR. ASHCROFT? OKAY. NEXT
- 9 IS BOB WINTERS.
- MR. WINTERS: GOOD AFTERNOON, MR.
- 11 CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. I HAVE EQUIVALENT
- 12 CONCERNS THAT -- I HAVE EQUIVALENT CONCERNS TO MS.
- 13 CARLSON'S AS WELL AS MR. ASHCROFT. I'VE BEEN IN
- 14 THE ASPHALT RUBBER INDUSTRY SINCE ITS INCEPTION.
- AS A MATTER OF FACT, THE RPA, THE RUBBER PAVEMENTS
- 16 ASSOCIATION, PREDECESSOR ASSOCIATION, WHICH WAS
- 17 THE ASPHALT RUBBER PRODUCERS GROUP AND THEN BECAME
- 18 THE RUBBER PAVEMENTS ASSOCIATION, WE WERE ONE OF
- 19 THE FOUNDING MEMBERS, AND I SERVED TWO TERMS AS
- 20 ITS PRESIDENT.
- JUST BY WAY OF PRESENTING OUR
- 22 CREDENTIALS RELATIVE TO EXPERIENCE, WE'VE BEEN
- 23 AROUND THIS INDUSTRY A LONG, LONG TIME. WE'VE
- 24 SEEN THE WET PROCESS, WE'VE SEEN DRY PROCESS,
- 25 WE'VE SEEN PATENTED PROCESSES, WE'VE SEEN

1 NONPATENTED PROCESSES. WE SELL RUBBER TO ALL. WE 2 DON'T DISCRIMINATE. THE FACT THAT THERE WAS A 3 PATENT IN PLACE IN ONE OF THE PROCESSES THAT WE 4 WERE VITALLY INTERESTED IN, THAT EXPIRED MANY 5 YEARS AGO, AND IT'S A VERY, VERY COMPETITIVE OPEN 6 INDUSTRY AT THIS TIME AND HAS BEEN FOR YEARS. 7 THE LACK OF BRINGING TO THE TABLE 8 AND TO THIS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTER, BE IT L.A. 9 COUNTY OR ANY OTHER AGENCY THAT WOULD BE INTERESTED AND QUALIFIED TO DO THIS WORK, IT 10 11 BOTHERS ME THAT WE'RE NOT APPARENTLY TAKING 12 ADVANTAGE OF ALL OF THE EXPERIENCE OF OUR RPA 13 MEMBERSHIP. WE HAVE A VAST WAREHOUSE OF KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE FROM PEOPLE WHO HAVE HANDS-ON DEALT 14 15 WITH THIS FROM A TECHNICAL STANDPOINT, FROM A MATERIALS STANDPOINT, FROM AN APPLICATION 16 17 STANDPOINT, AND A QUALITY CONTROL STANDPOINT. AND 18 WE WOULD HATE TO SEE THIS TURN INTO A REINVENTING OF THE WHEEL, IF YOU WILL, AS OPPOSED TO 19 20 DISSEMINATING THE TECHNOLOGY THAT IS WELL OVER 95 21 PERCENT OF WHAT IS BEING DONE IN THE COUNTRY TODAY 22 AND CERTAINLY WELL OVER 97 PERCENT OF WHAT IS 23 BEING DONE IN CALIFORNIA TODAY AND WITH A HIGH 24 DEGREE OF SUCCESS. 25 THE INDUSTRY WANTS TO CONTRIBUTE

TO

```
1
      THIS VERY WORTHWHILE PROJECT. WE WOULD LOVE TO
      SEE THIS BE AVAILABLE TO ALL OF THE CITIES,
 2
 3
      COUNTIES, AND OTHER AGENCIES IN THE STATE OF
 4
      CALIFORNIA. AND WITH THAT, I'LL JUST REQUEST THAT
 5
      YOU RESPECTFULLY LOOK INTO THE POSSIBILITY OF AN
 б
      RFP WHERE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES ARE MORE
 7
      CLEARLY DESIGNED, AT LEAST TO US, SO THAT WE KNOW
 8
      WHAT THE FOCUS IS AND CAN CONTRIBUTE TO EITHER
      ADVISING THE BOARD OR ADVISING THE TECHNOLOGY
 9
10
      TRANSFER CENTER AS TO WHAT OTHER INPUT WOULD BE
11
      USEFUL IN THIS PROCESS.
12
                CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU. ANY
13
      QUESTIONS OF MR. WINTERS? THANK YOU, MR. WINTERS.
14
                BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I HAVE A COMMENT,
15
      MR. CHAIRMAN. I'M OPEN ABOUT THIS IDEA OF WHETHER
16
      WE SPECIFY WITH AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT OR WE
      COMPETE, BUT ONE THING THAT DOES OCCUR TO ME --
17
      AGAIN, I HOPE I'M NOT BEATING A DEAD HORSE -- BUT
18
19
      USING THE COMPOST DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AGAIN AS
20
      A PARALLEL OR A METAPHOR. JUST AS A FARMER
21
      TALKING TO A FARMER HAS MORE CREDIBILITY THAN A
22
      GOVERNMENT PERSON TALKING TO A FARMER, IT DOES
23
      SEEM TO ME THAT ONE OF THE BENEFITS OF L.A.
2.4
      COUNTY'S CONCEPT IS, AND ALSO THE IDEA THAT I'M
      PUTTING FORTH, IS THAT PUBLIC ROAD BUILDERS
```

1 TALKING TO PUBLIC ROAD BUILDERS AS OPPOSED TO 2 NECESSARILY TALKING TO THE PEOPLE WHO SELL THEM 3 THINGS -- AND I'M NOT PUTTING DOWN THE PEOPLE WHO SELL THEM THINGS. DON'T GET ME WRONG -- BUT JUST 4 5 LIKE I'M NOT PUTTING DOWN GOVERNMENT PEOPLE WHEN I 6 SAY FARMERS WOULD RATHER THAN LISTEN TO FARMERS, I 7 THINK THAT'S SOMETHING TO CONSIDER, THAT PART OF 8 THE CREDIBILITY OF THIS THING IS THAT I KNOW ROAD 9 SUPERINTENDENTS SHARE THE SAME PROBLEMS AND PERSPECTIVES AND PROBABLY HAVE A ROLE IN 10 11 COMMUNICATING THIS STUFF TO EACH OTHER. SO THAT'S 12 SOMETHING FOR US TO CONSIDER AS WE EXPLORE THE 13 OUESTION OF WHAT'S THE BEST METHOD TO GET THIS PROJECT GOING, WHETHER IT'S THROUGH A COMPETITIVE 14 15 PROCESS OR AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IN OTHER WORDS, 16 17 WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS LOCAL 18 GOVERNMENT. 19 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: RIGHT. 20 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. NEXT WE HAVE 21 MICHAEL HARRINGTON. YOU CHANGED JOBS? WHAT'S 22 GOING ON? 23 MR. HARRINGTON: BIG COMPANY. I WISH I 24 HAD SOMETHING TO SAY ABOUT RUBBERIZED ASPHALT.

THEY'VE JUST BEEN ROLLING RIGHT ALONG HERE.

- 1 FORTUNATELY OR UNFORTUNATELY I WOULD LIKE TO GO 2 BACK AND ADDRESS THE PLAYGROUND MATS, SOME OF THE 3 OUESTIONS THAT MR. FRAZEE BROUGHT UP, ALONG WITH A COMMENT ON POSSIBLY WHAT MRS. GOTCH WAS TALKING 4 5 ABOUT. 6 I GUESS ONE WAY TO QUICKLY LOOK AT 7 IT IS WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE 8 ENDS HERE. SOMETHING THAT IS A BENEFIT TO 9 CHILDREN THROUGHOUT THE STATE AND SOMETHING THAT IS NEEDED IN THE STATE, PLAYGROUND SURFACING, IS 10 ALSO SOMETHING THAT, THROUGH THE BOARD'S KIND OF 11 12 DIRECTIVE FROM THE TIRE GRANT FUND, COULD ALSO 13 LOOK AT HELPING WITH, NOT SPECIFICALLY BECAUSE THEY'RE DOING SOMETHING FOR CHILDREN, BUT FOR 14 MARKET DEVELOPMENT FOR A NEW PRODUCT THAT IS 15 USING 16 CRUMB RUBBER FROM WHOLE TIRE RECYCLING. I AM NOT AWARE OF THE 290 SOME
- 17
- THOUSAND YOU HAVE EXPENDED IN OTHER 18 APPLICATIONS
- OR OTHER VARIOUS THINGS. I KNOW THAT WE GOT 19

20 GRANT FROM THE BOARD TO DEVELOP -- TO

SPECIFICALLY

Α

21 DEVELOP A PLAYGROUND MAT THAT WOULD BE MADE

100	
22	PERCENT FROM CRUMB RUBBER FROM WHOLE TIRE
23	RECYCLING, WHICH WE HAVE DONE AND WHICH WE
HAVE	
24	SPENT WELL IN EXCESS, MUCH TO THE CHAGRIN OF
THE 25 ORIGINA	PRINCIPALS OF THE COMPANY WHEN THEY ALLY GOT

1 INTO IT. AS A MATTER OF FACT, A MAGNITUDE OF ABOUT THREE TIMES THAT TO GET TO THE POSITION 2 3 WHERE WE ARE TODAY. MR. PENNINGTON, I THINK, QUITE 4 RIGHTFULLY, INDICATED HE DID NOT WANT THE GRANT 5 6 PROGRAM TO BECOME SOMETHING TO CREATE A MARKET, 7 BUT HE CERTAINLY LOOKED AT THE GRANT PROGRAM AS 8 BEING SOMETHING TO HELP STIMULATE A MARKET. AND I 9 THINK WE WOULD AGREE WITH THAT, THAT WE ARE NOT HERE WITH HAT IN HAND SAYING, "GEE. WOULD YOU 10 CREATE A MARKET FROM US?" WE ARE HERE SAYING 11 THAT, AS A NEW COMPANY, AS THE ONLY COMPANY THAT 12 13 I'M AWARE OF IN THE UNITED STATES, AND WE'VE STARTED ATTENDING NATIONAL SHOWS, THAT MAKE A MAT 14 100 PERCENT FROM CRUMB RUBBER FROM WHOLE TIRE 15 16 RECYCLING. THERE ARE MATS MADE FROM SCRAP RUBBER. 17 THERE ARE MATS MADE FROM PORTIONS OF TIRES. WE'RE 18 THE ONLY ONES THAT, I THINK, THAT ARE MAKING ANYTHING EVEN CLOSE TO 100 PERCENT RECYCLED 19 20 MATERIAL MAT FROM TIRES. 21 AND, AGAIN, THIS IS THE TIRE 22 RECYCLING FUND MONEY THAT WE ARE ALLOCATING WHILE 23 THE BOARD HAS ITS WIDE RANGE OF OBJECTIVES THAT 24 THEY HAVE TO MEET, INCLUDING RUBBER -- DIVERSION

FROM LANDFILL OF ALL RUBBER PRODUCTS. WE'RE

1 TALKING SPECIFICALLY HERE ABOUT TIRE RUBBER. 2 MRS. GOTCH -- AND IT REALLY KIND OF 3 BROUGHT IT HOME WHEN SHE WAS TALKING ABOUT RURAL 4 COUNTIES. PLAYGROUNDS ARE NOT ONLY FOR CHILDREN 5 THAT ARE, OH, ABLE TO USE ALL THE EQUIPMENT TO ITS б MAXIMUM -- THE MAXIMUM DESIGN. WE'VE GOT RURAL 7 COUNTY REQUESTS FROM A NORTHERN RURAL COUNTY FOR A SPECIAL NEEDS PLAYGROUND, SOMETHING WHERE SAND OR 8 MULCH OR ANY OF THE OTHER VARIETY OF THINGS THAT 9 10 MAY SOFTEN, DID NOT PROVIDE ACCESS TO MOBILITY 11 IMPAIRED STUDENTS. WE'RE WORKING ON A WAY --12 WE'VE GIVEN SEVERAL PLAYGROUND INSTALLATIONS AWAY. WE'RE LOOKING AT SOME WAY TO REALLY HELP THEM OUT 13 14 BECAUSE IT'S THE KIND OF THING THAT YOU JUST WANT 15 TO DO. AND HOPEFULLY, I THINK THAT'S WHAT 16 THE BOARD WAS REACHING FOR IN THIS PARTICULAR 17 18 GRANT REQUEST, SOMETHING THAT WOULD STIMULATE 19 MARKETS. AND WE'RE TALKING ABOUT NOT ONLY HERE IN 20 CALIFORNIA. I KNOW THERE WAS BIG CONCENTRATION ON 21 HOW MANY PLAYGROUNDS IN CALIFORNIA AND HOW MANY 22 SCHOOLS AND HOW MANY THIS, BUT WE'RE LOOKING NOT 23 ONLY AT CALIFORNIA, WE'RE LOOKING NATIONALLY. SO 24 WE HOPE TO BE EXPORTING TIRE RUBBER TO OTHER STATES IN THE FORM OF PLAYGROUND MATS, BUT WE 25

1 REALLY DO NEED SOME ASSISTANCE AND ESPECIALLY IN THE BEGINNING YEARS TO COMPETE WITH THE LONG 2 3 ESTABLISHED PEOPLE THAT ARE PROVIDING MATS MADE 4 FROM OTHER MATERIALS. 5 AND WITH THAT, I'LL KIND OF BE QUIET AND LET YOU ASK ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU MAY OR MAY 6 7 NOT HAVE. 8 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: QUESTIONS OF MR. HARRINGTON? I HAVE ONE QUESTION. 9 THE 10 ENVIRONMENTAL MOLDING CONCEPT, WHAT YOU SAID IS 11 YOU'RE THE ONLY COMPANY THAT MAKES HUNDRED PERCENT 12 CRUMB RUBBER FROM WHOLE TIRE RECYCLING? MR. HARRINGTON: IT'S THE ONLY COMPANY 13 14 THAT AS ITS PRODUCT -- AS ITS RAW MATERIAL SOURCE 15 USES 100 PERCENT CRUMB RUBBER FROM WHOLE TIRE 16 RECYCLING. THERE ARE VERY FEW WHOLE TIRE 17 RECYCLERS IN THE COUNTRY. NOW, THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE THAT MAKE MATS OUT OF TIRE PRODUCTS OR TIRE 18 PIECES OR TIRE BUFFINGS. WE'RE THE ONLY ONES THAT 19 20 I'M AWARE OF THAT USE WHOLE TIRE RECYCLED 2.1 MATERIAL. 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: SO IF WE ADOPTED 23 MRS. GOTCH'S \$300,000 AND YOUR SUGGESTION, YOUR

COMPANY WOULD BE THE ONLY COMPANY THAT WOULD

2.4

25

BENEFIT FROM IT?

- 1 MR. HARRINGTON: NO, NOT AT ALL.
- 2 ENVIRONMENTAL MOLDING CONCEPTS MANUFACTURES USING
- 3 THIS. I AM HOPEFUL, AS YOU SHOULD BE HOPEFUL,
- 4 THAT YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE, THEN, OTHER COMPANIES
- 5 THAT CURRENTLY USE OTHER MATERIALS, REALLY LOOK TO
- 6 WHOLE TIRE RECYCLED RUBBER AS A MANUFACTURING
- 7 PRODUCT TO GET AWAY FROM SOME OF THE OTHER SCRAP
- 8 MATERIALS AND GET INTO RECYCLED CRUMB RUBBER. I
- 9 THINK THAT ABSOLUTELY WILL HAPPEN.
- 10 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: BUT AS THINGS STAND
- 11 RIGHT NOW, YOU ARE THE ONLY COMPANY -- YOU JUST
- 12 SAID THAT YOU'RE THE ONLY COMPANY THAT DOES A
- 13 HUNDRED PERCENT --
- 14 MR. HARRINGTON: THAT DOES A HUNDRED
- 15 PERCENT, BUT IF YOU --
- 16 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: -- WHOLE TIRES.
- 17 WHAT YOU'RE SUGGESTING IS WHAT THE CRITERIA FOR
- 18 THESE MATS SHOULD BE.
- MR. HARRINGTON: NO, I DIDN'T
- 20 SPECIFICALLY EXCLUDE BUFFINGS. I THINK WE
- 21 ABSOLUTELY DO NOT EXCLUDE BUFFINGS.
- 22 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THEN I MISREAD YOUR
- LETTER.
- 24 MR. HARRINGTON: WELL, THEN, I APOLOGIZE
- 25 IF THAT WAS -- IF THAT WAS AN INFERENCE MADE.

1 WHILE WE DON'T WANT TO PRECLUDE ANYBODY FROM USING TIRE RUBBER FROM BUFFINGS, WE THINK THAT WE HAVE 2 3 TAKEN THAT NEXT STEP IN USING CRUMB RUBBER FROM 100 PERCENT RECYCLING, BUT WE DO NOT WANT TO 4 5 PRECLUDE SOMEBODY FROM USING RUBBER FROM TIRE 6 BUFFINGS. AT ONE POINT WE DID THINK ABOUT THAT, 7 AND I HOPE I STRUCK IT FROM THE LETTER I WROTE. Ι 8 APOLOGIZE AND PLEASE STRIKE IT. THAT SHOULD NOT 9 BE THERE. 10 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU. BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: MY COMMENT WAS THAT 11 I WASN'T TRYING TO -- IN FACT, MY FOCUS IS ON THE 12 13 RECYCLED FROM CRUMB RUBBER GENERATED IN THE STATE 14 OF CALIFORNIA, AND I WASN'T SUGGESTING THAT WE --CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I DON'T THINK YOU 15 16 WERE SUGGESTING THAT. I'M JUST SAYING IF WE 17 FOLLOWED HIS SUGGESTION, HIS COMPANY --MR. HARRINGTON: I'M SORRY. THAT SHOULD 18 19 NOT HAVE -- THAT WAS NOT THE INTENT. WE WANT TO 20 PROMOTE OBVIOUSLY THE USE OF CRUMB RUBBER FROM 21 WHOLE TIRE RECYCLING, BUT WE DON'T WANT TO EXCLUDE 22 THOSE THAT ARE CURRENTLY MARKETING MATS THAT ARE

23

MADE FROM TIRE BUFFINGS.

24 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: FINE. THANK YOU, 25 MR. HARRINGTON.

1	NEXT WE HAVE ED TOMEO.
2	MR. TOMEO: HI. GOOD AFTERNOON. I'M ED
3	TOMEO FROM UNITED AMERICAN ENERGY AND OUR
4	SUBSIDIARY COMPANY, UA ENERGY, IS THE OPERATOR OF
5	THE MODESTO ENERGY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP. I'M
6	PLEASED TO BE ABLE TO SPEAK WITH YOU TODAY AS YOU
7	ARE TRYING TO DIVVY UP THE DOLLARS. CERTAINLY TO
8	USE A BAD METAPHOR, TODAY IS THE DAY THAT THE
9	RUBBER MEETS THE ROAD.
10	BASICALLY I WANT TO POINT OUT,
11	PERHAPS AGAIN, THAT MODESTO ENERGY LIMITED
12	PARTNERSHIP IS ONE OF YOUR FINEST SUCCESS STORIES
13	WHEN YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT DEALING WITH TIRES. WE
14	CONSUME SIX MILLION TIRES A YEAR, WHICH REPRESENTS
15	ONE-THIRD OF ALL THE TIRES YOU CURRENTLY RECYCLE.
16	WE CONSUME THE SAME AMOUNT THAT THE
17	CEMENT INDUSTRY IN ITS ENTIRETY CONSUMES. WE HAVE
18	HAD A NUMBER OF PARTIES TALKING ABOUT THEIR
19	EXPECTATIONS TODAY OR THEIR HOPES TODAY.
20	A MAJOR RUBBERIZED ASPHALT PROJECT
21	THAT WAS JUST MENTIONED HALF AN HOUR AGO, LESS
22	THAN HALF AN HOUR AGO, CONSUMED 180 SOME THOUSAND
23	TIRES. THAT'S A LITTLE BIT OVER A WEEK OF OUR
24 25 THE	OPERATION. PLAYGROUND MATS WILL REPRESENT HOURS OF OPERATION FOR US FOR WHAT THEY WOULD PUT ON

1 PLAYGROUNDS IN A YEAR. AND WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE WASTE BOARD'S MANDATE OF TRYING TO TAKE CARE OF 2 3 WASTE STREAMS, I THINK WE'RE DOING THAT VERY WELL. IT'S ALSO IMPORTANT TO POINT OUT 4 5 THAT IT IS IN AN ENVIRONMENTALLY BENIGN MANNER AND 6 CONSISTENT WITH YOUR RECYCLING OBJECTIVES. WE 7 PRODUCE 14 MEGAWATTS OF ELECTRICITY, WHICH WILL 8 POWER 15,000 HOMES. WE PRODUCE IRON OXIDE, WHICH 9 IS RECYCLED IN THE CEMENT INDUSTRY RIGHT NOW. WE PRODUCE A ZINC RICH FLY ASH, WHICH IS RECYCLED TO 10 THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY, AND WE PRODUCE GYPSUM, 11 12 WHICH IS RECYCLED TO THE AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY. 13 AND RIGHT NOW THE ONLY THING WE THROW AWAY IS MAYBE THE STUFF THAT COMES OUT OF THE OFFICE 14 BECAUSE IT'S TOO FAR AWAY TO RECYCLE THE PAPER. I 15 16 DON'T KNOW. 17 IT JUST SO HAPPENS THAT THIS 18 FACILITY IS SITED AT THE STATE'S LARGEST TIRE PILE. AND THAT'S KIND OF A PROBLEM BECAUSE I HAVE 19 20 MENTIONED BEFORE THAT MY BUSINESS' OBJECTIVE IS TO 21 SAVE THIS PROJECT FROM THE ELECTRIC PRICING CLIFF 22 DATE THAT WAS MENTIONED EARLIER BY MR. BYRNE. 23 WISH I COULD TELL YOU THAT I'M SURE WE'RE GOING TO 24 MAKE THAT. I CAN'T RIGHT NOW. BUT AS OF 25 SEPTEMBER OF NEXT YEAR, WE WILL HAVE A VERY

1 IMPORTANT DATE IN FRONT OF ALL OF US. 2 IN THE MEANTIME I UNDERSTAND THE 3 OBJECTIVE OF THE BOARD IS TO TAKE CARE OF LEGACY PILES. MY LONGER-TERM OBJECTIVE IS TO TAKE CARE 4 OF THIS FACILITY. WE WILL AGAIN INITIATE 5 6 LEGISLATION AND HOPEFULLY INCREASE TIP FEES THE 7 WAY THAT MR. CHESBRO HAS RECOMMENDED OR AT LEAST 8 ALLUDED TO EARLIER TODAY, AND HOPEFULLY WE'LL GET 9 MORE SUPPORT THAN WE DID LAST YEAR AND GET DOLLARS TO END USERS BECAUSE I THINK WHEN WE'RE TALKING 10 ABOUT PROVIDING MARKET IMPETUS, IT'S DOLLARS THAT 11 PROVIDE THAT. 12 13 AND BASICALLY YOUR NEAR-TERM PROBLEM WITH REGARD TO THE PILE, I WANT TO POINT OUT A FEW 14 RECENT CHANGES THAT I THINK ARE IMPORTANT FOR THE 15 BOARD'S CONSIDERATION. I BELIEVE THE BOARD HAS A 16 17 COPY OF A LETTER THAT WAS RECENTLY SENT BY US TO 18 OTR. MELP WILL NOT BE ACCEPTING TIRES FROM OTR AS OF DECEMBER 1ST. SO WITH REGARD TO CONSUMPTION OF 19 20 TIRE PILE OR, FOR THAT MATTER, CONSUMPTION OF TIRES FROM OFF THE ROAD, IT WILL NOT BE VIA OTR'S 21 22 TIRES. SO I QUESTION MR. BRYNE'S PROPOSAL, NOT 23 THAT HE DOESN'T HAVE GOOD INTENTIONS OF TRYING TO 24 REDUCE THAT TIRE PILE; BUT WHEN HE SPEAKS FOR 25 MELP, I DON'T THINK HE CAN DO THAT ANY LONGER.

IT IS, HOWEVER, IMPORTANT TO POINT 1 OUT THAT UNDER THE CONTRACT BETWEEN MELP AND OTR, 2 3 THE BOARD DOES HAVE THE RIGHT TO BECOME A TIRE 4 PROVIDER TO US IN THE EVENT OF AN OTR DEFAULT. 5 AND THAT RIGHT CAME ABOUT DURING THE PERMITTING 6 PROCESS AND WAS PUT IN AFTER QUITE A BIT OF 7 NEGOTIATION BETWEEN US AND OTR. AND I WOULD 8 CERTAINLY SUGGEST THAT YOU LOOK SERIOUSLY AT THAT RIGHT AND CONTEMPLATE WORKING WITH US. 9 10 MELP DID PROVIDE A DRAFT PROPOSAL A 11 NUMBER OF MONTHS AGO TO MR. CHANDLER, RECOMMENDING 12 THAT WE COULD BE A TOOL IN YOUR GETTING RID OF THE LARGEST LEGACY TIRE PILE IN THE STATE OF 13 14 CALIFORNIA. THE PROPOSAL REPRESENTS THE LOWEST 15 COST TIRE PILE REDUCTION ON THE DOLLARS PER TIRE 16 BASIS OF ANY REMEDIATION THAT YOU HAVE EVER DONE, 17 PROBABLY IN ORDER OF MAGNITUDE OF A NUMBER OF YOUR 18 REMEDIATIONS; IN OTHER WORDS, ONE-TENTH OF THE 19 PRICE ON A DOLLARS PER TIRE BASIS. 20 WE WILL BE SEEKING THIRD-PARTY TIRES 21 FROM OTHER PERSONS IN THIS ROOM AND PERSONS NOT IN 22 THIS ROOM IN ORDER TO CONTINUE TO FEED OUR FUEL 23 REQUIREMENTS OF 500,000 TIRES PER MONTH. 2.4 HOPE THAT THE BOARD MAY BECOME A PROVIDER OF SOME

OR ALL OF THOSE TIRES IN THE FUTURE.

1	BUT YOU'VE TALKED ABOUT THE \$500,000
2	AT THE BOTTOM OF THE LIST, AND I'M A BUSINESSMAN
3	THAT KNOWS THAT IF DOLLARS AREN'T SPECIFICALLY
4	OUTLINED FOR A BUDGET LINE ITEM, BUT RATHER IN A
5	NEBULOUS CONTINGENCY FEE THAT THERE WILL BE LOTS
6	OF TIME BEFORE THOSE DOLLARS MAY COME LOOSE, A
7	PORTION OF THEM MAY HAVE TO BE SAVED FOR FIRES, A
8	PORTION OF THEM MAY TAKE ANOTHER 10,000 TIRES INTO
9	PLAYGROUND MATS, AND I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THAT.
10	CONCERNED BOTH AS THE BUSINESSMAN RUNNING MELP,
11	BUT MORE SO AS A CITIZEN OF CALIFORNIA BECAUSE
12	THAT 500,000 TIRES WILL REPRESENT TWO AND A
13	QUARTER MILLION TIRES THAT OUR FACILITY CAN
14	CONSUME IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROPOSAL THAT WE'VE
15	PUT IN FRONT OF THE BOARD.
16	AND EARLIER THERE WAS A MENTION OF
17	CLEANING UP OF PILES IS REALLY USELESS WORK
18	BECAUSE IT'S JUST DIVERTING TIRES FROM THE
19	MARKETPLACE. THAT'S TRUE TO AN EXTENT, BUT WE
20	ALSO RECOGNIZE THAT IF YOU'RE CLEANING UP A PILE
21	AND NOT TAKING IN A PILE SORRY CLEANING UP
A	
22	PILE AND NOT TAKING A TIRE OFF THE ROAD, THE
TIRE	

THAT WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE COME IN FROM THE ROAD

24	GOING TO) GO	TO	Α	LEGAL	LANI	FILL	AS	OPPOSED	TO	Α
2.5	LEGACY T	TRE	PTT	Æ.	SO	WHEN	ESTAI	3T.T.	SHING YO	ΠR	

1 PRIORITIES TODAY, I THINK THERE'S NOTHING WRONG WITH LOOKING AT LEGACY TIRE PILES FIRST AND THEN 2 3 THINKING ABOUT STIMULATING MARKET, AND YOU CAN DO 4 SO WITH ME OVER THE COURSE OF 1997 WHEN WE'RE 5 TRYING AGAIN AT A LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE. 6 BASICALLY AS A BUSINESS MELP NEEDS 7 TIRES AND DOLLARS FOR TIRES TO SURVIVE. AS A 8 CITIZEN, I SIDE WITH MR. PENNINGTON'S OBSERVATIONS VERY EARLY ON, THAT THERE'S TREMENDOUS RISK IN A 9 10 TIRE PILE. AND THE FRESNO TIRE FIRE CERTAINLY WAS 11 A VIVID REMINDER FOR ALL OF US THAT NOT ONLY ARE 12 TIRES A PROBLEM STATICALLY WHEN THEY HAVE MOSQUITOES AND RATS AND STUFF, BUT THEY'RE 13 14 CERTAINLY A PROBLEM IF THERE SHOULD BE A FIRE, 15 WHEN NOT ONLY DO YOU HAVE THE AIR POLLUTION, BUT YOU HAVE TREMENDOUS WATER AND GROUND POLLUTION. 16 17 OUT OF THAT MILLION TIRES, I'D REALLY BE INTERESTED TO FIND OUT HOW MANY MILLIONS OF 18 19 DOLLARS ARE GOING TO BE SPENT ON THE CLEANUP OF 20 THAT FACILITY. 21 SO I WOULD JUST VERY STRONGLY 22 ADVOCATE THAT THE BOARD CONSIDER HELPING MELP LONG 23 TERM AND ALSO TAKING CARE OF YOUR LEGACY TIRE PILE

- PROBLEM SHORT TERM. THANK YOU AND I'LL FIELD QUESTIONS.

1 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: QUESTIONS? OKAY. THANK YOU. NEXT DR. BARRY TAKALLOU. 2 3 DR. TAKALLOU: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF 4 THE BOARD, I JUST HAVE TO -- FOR THE RECORD, I 5 NEED TO MAKE A FEW CORRECTIONS IN SOME OF THE 6 TESTIMONY PREVIOUSLY WAS MADE. MS. DONNA CARLSON 7 FROM RPA, SHE MENTIONED SHE FIND OUT ABOUT THE 8 REQUEST FOR THE PROPOSAL BY L.A. COUNTY BY NOVEMBER 13TH. HOWEVER, IF ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS 9 10 REMEMBER, THIS STARTED IN A WORKSHOP WAY BACK IN 11 SEPTEMBER 5TH, AND EVER SINCE WE BEEN TO TWO BOARD 12 MEETINGS, AT TWO OR THREE COMMITTEE MEETINGS. AND MR. BOB WINTERS, MEMBER OF THE RPA, MR. MIKE 13 14 HARRINGTON, MEMBERS OF THE RPA HAVE BEEN SITTING 15 ALL THESE INDIVIDUAL MEETINGS, AND NOW WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THEY DIDN'T KNOW ABOUT IT. OF 16 17 COURSE, PEOPLE FROM ARIZONA DON'T NEED TO KNOW 18 ABOUT IT. 19 WE -- I THINK THE WASTE OF OUR 20 TAXPAYERS' MONEY TO GO TO ANOTHER ROUND AND ROUND 21 OF WORKSHOPS, WHILE THERE IS A LOCAL AGENCY IS 22 GOING TO TAKE THIS FLAG AND SPREAD OUT THIS 23 INFORMATION AMONG THEIR OWN COLLEAGUES. IF THE 2.4 OBJECTIVE WAS LET'S GO TO FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, OF

COURSE, THERE'S AN RFP. LET'S GET SOUTHERN

1 CALIFORNIA TO DO GOOD ON THAT. WE GIVE YOU TEN YEARS OF RESEARCH. AFTER TEN YEARS, THEY GOING TO 2 3 SAY THE CONCLUSION, MORE RESEARCH IS NEEDED. I 4 CAN ASSURE YOU THAT. 5 BUT THE OBJECTIVE OF THIS CENTER IS 6 THE DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION AND ALSO SAVE 7 TAXPAYERS' MONEY, AND MORE IMPORTANT THAN THAT IS 8 THE CHARGE WHICH THIS BOARD HAS, SAVE PUBLIC HEALTH. I NOTICED MR. PENNINGTON WAS WORRIED 9 10 ABOUT PUBLIC HEALTH AND RESERVE MONEY. I WANT TO 11 SHOW YOU SOME OF THE CALTRANS HEALTH DATA IN 12 REGARD TO RUBBERIZED ASPHALT. THE SAME RPA, THEY HAVE HAD THIS 13 14 PUBLIC DATA, PUBLIC INFORMATION FOR YEARS. AND AS 15 I DISPLAYED FOR YOU HERE, THIS IS A CALTRANS MEMORANDUM. WANT TO FOCUS IT FOR YOU. I 16 17 SUMMARIZED IT FOR YOU ON THIS MEMORANDUM. AND THE 18 RECENT CALTRANS INTERVIEW PEOPLE WORK WITH 19 SO-CALLED RUBBERIZED ASPHALT PROMOTED BY RPA. OUT 20 OF THE 70 PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN INTERVIEWED, 48 PEOPLE GOT SICK. AND MR. FRAZEE MENTIONED, THIS 21 22 IS THE CHARGE OF THIS BOARD, TO SAVE PUBLIC 23 HEALTH.

THIS DATA IS PUBLICLY. IT'S GOING

TO BE IN FRONT OF YOU. SEVENTY OUT OF -- 48 OUT

2.4

1 OF 70 GOT SICK. THIRTY-TWO PEOPLE, THEY HAD THROAT IRRITATION, 27 EYE PROBLEMS, 27 HEADACHES, 2 3 21 BREATHING PROBLEMS, 20 PEOPLE NAUSEA, 5 PEOPLE 4 COUGHING PROBLEMS, 3 PEOPLE VOMITING, AND 1 PEOPLE 5 SKIN PROBLEMS. SO IT'S IMPORTANT THIS CENTER, 6 WHICH IS LOCATED AND BY A PUBLIC AGENCY TO 7 DISSEMINATE GOOD AND BAD DATA AND DON'T FILTER THE 8 BAD ONES. 9 AND ALSO I'M GOING TO DISPLAY IT FOR 10 YOU ANOTHER PIECE OF REPORT FROM CALTRANS, WHICH 11 SHOWS THE SO-CALLED ASPHALT RUBBER BINDER PROJECTS 12 CALTRANS HAS BEEN USED. AND THIS IS STUDY, OUT OF 97 PROJECTS, 44 PERCENT OF THESE PROJECTS ARE 13 14 PERFORMING POORLY. AND THIS IS CALTRANS REPORT. 15 THIS IS OUR TAXPAYERS' MONEY. 16 SO I THINK AN INDEPENDENT CENTER 17 WHICH IS AWAY FROM RESEARCH. I THINK WE DONE OUITE A BIT OF RESEARCH ALREADY TO GET OUT SOME OF 18 THESE FACTUAL DATA OUT, AND THE PRIMARY GOAL 19 20 SHOULD BE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE END RESULT 21 SPECIFICATIONS. THEN AMONG DIFFERENT PRODUCERS 22 THERE'S NOT GOING TO BE ANY ARGUMENT. IF THE 23 FINAL PRODUCT, WE HAVE A STANDARDS FOR FINAL 2.4 PRODUCT TO BE TESTED AND MEET THESE STANDARDS,

THAT'S ALL GOING TO BE -- GOING TO GET AWAY FROM

ALL THESE ARGUMENTS.

1

AND VERY LAST, PUBLIC TAXPAYERS' 2 3 IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, UNTIL A YEAR AGO, THE AVERAGE PRICE OF ASPHALT RUBBER WAS ON AVERAGE 4 ABOUT 55 TO \$60 PER TON. IN BAY AREA IT WAS \$100 5 6 PER TON. AND WITH THE RECENT WORK BY SMALLER 7 CITIES, SUCH AS CITY OF LAGUNA NIGUEL AND DANA 8 POINT, THESE PRICES NOW IS MORE COMPETITIVE. WE 9 ARE SEEING PRICES AS LOW AS \$38 PER TON. SO WHAT HAPPENED? ALL OF THESE YEARS, BIG UNIVERSITIES, 10 THEY WERE DOING THIS RESEARCH. NOBODY BOTHERED 11 AND SAY, "HEY, YOU KNOW, THIS TAXPAYERS' MONEY, 12 13 WHERE IS GOING?" BASED ON THE TWO MILLION TONS CONSUMPTION BY CALIFORNIA ANNUALLY, REDUCTION OF 14 15 \$20 PER TON, YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT \$40 MILLION PER 16 YEAR. 17 AND THIS CENTER, ONE OF THE FUNCTION 18 OF THE CENTER IS GOING TO BE ON INTERNET ALL THE PRICES ON DAILY BASIS. ANY PRICES GOING TO COME 19 20 OUT IS GOING TO GO ON THE INTERNET, SO EVERYBODY 21 HAVE ACCESS. SO THE GUY SITTING IN NORTHERN 22 CALIFORNIA, HE KNOWS WHAT'S THE REAL PRICES AND WE 23 ARE NO LONGER GOING TO HONOR \$100 PER TON. 24 AND AS FAR AS THE DIRECTION OF THESE 25 CENTER, AS I UNDERSTAND, THE CENTER IS GOING TO BE

- 1 OPERATE UNDER EXECUTIVE BOARD COMMITTEE, WHICH
- 2 MEMBERS OF THIS BOARD GOING TO HAVE A MEMBERSHIP,
- 3 MEMBERS OF THE INDUSTRY GOING TO HAVE A MEMBERSHIP
- 4 IN THIS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: YOU KNOW MORE THAN
- 6 WE DO, SO I'M INTERESTED.
- 7 DR. TAKALLOU: AND -- AND WHAT I'M SAYING
- 8 TO YOU, WE CAN WASTE TIME, GO TO ANOTHER SETS OF
- 9 RFP IF YOU WISH TO, AND THE RESULT IS GOING TO
- 10 BE -- UNIVERSITIES ARE VERY GOOD ON SENDING YOU
- 11 VERY THICK GOOD PROPOSALS AND GO TO ANOTHER ROUND
- OF RESEARCH, BUT THE FUNCTION OF THIS CENTER IS
- 13 GOING TO BE DISSEMINATION OF GOOD AND BAD
- 14 INFORMATION, EVERYTHING. ANY QUESTIONS?
- 15 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY QUESTIONS FOR
- DR. TAKALLOU? OKAY. THANK YOU. AND FINALLY
- 17 CAROLYN BAKER.
- 18 MS. BAKER: NOT SO FINALLY. THANK YOU,
- 19 MR. CHAIRMAN AND BOARD MEMBERS. CAROLYN BAKER
- 20 REPRESENTING THE COGENERATION ASH COALITION.

I'M

21 HERE IN SUPPORT OF ONE OF YOUR MARKET

DEVELOPMENT

22 PROPOSALS FOR NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, THAT BEING

THE

23	\$200,000 ALLOCATION FOR COAL AND COGENERATION	Ν.
24	AS YOU KNOW, WE'RE A GROUP OF	
25 IN	COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS WHO ARE VERY INTERES'	ΓED

1 SUPPLANTING OUR FUEL WITH TIRES, AND WE CONSER-VATIVELY ESTIMATE THAT WE CAN BURN A MINIMUM OF 2 3 SIX TO SEVEN MILLION TIRES PER YEAR. 4 WANTED TO JUST REMIND THE BOARD, 5 HOWEVER, THOUGH, THAT THE \$200,000 HAS BEEN 6 EARMARKED FOR EMISSIONS TESTING, AND WE ARE VERY 7 SUPPORTIVE OF THAT. WE KNOW WE NEED TO DO THAT AS 8 A PRELIMINARY FIRST STEP, BUT IT'S ALSO CRITICAL 9 TO REMEMBER THAT FOR US THAT'S THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG, AND THAT'S WHAT WE CONSIDER JUST THE BARE 10 11 BONES TO GET US STARTED ON THIS PROJECT. 12 IT'S, THEREFORE, CRITICAL TO US THAT 13 THE INTEGRITY OF THAT \$200,000 AMOUNT BE MAINTAINED. WE'RE VERY APPRECIATIVE OF THE BOARD 14 WORKING WITH US ON THIS. WE'RE ENTHUSIASTIC AND 15 OPTIMISTIC ABOUT MOVING FORWARD. AS A MATTER OF 16 17 FACT, ONE OF MY MEMBER COMPANIES IS CHOMPING AT 18 THE BIT READY TO GET GOING AND ACTUALLY START DOING THE EMISSIONS TESTING AS SOON AS THE BOARD 19 20 IS READY TO DO SO. SO I JUST WANTED TO THANK YOU 21 AGAIN FOR WHAT WE CONSIDER A WIN-WIN SITUATION FOR 22 THE BOARD AND FOR US. THANK YOU. 23 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU. ANY 24 QUESTIONS OF MS. BAKER? MR. WINTERS HAS ASKED TO

SPEAK AGAIN TO REBUT MR. HARRINGTON AND DR.

- 1 TAKALLOU. I THINK WE'VE HEARD ENOUGH, AND I DON'T
- 2 THINK THE BOARD WANTS TO GET INTO A DEBATING
- 3 SOCIETY HERE. SO I THINK WE'LL MOVE ON IF THAT'S
- 4 OKAY. OKAY.
- 5 WE HAVE A MOTION ON THE FLOOR. WHY
- 6 DON'T I TRY TO GO THROUGH IT AGAIN.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I'M JUST GOING TO
- 8 SUGGEST AND INDICATE THAT I'M WILLING TO VOTE FOR
- 9 THE MOTION AS IT STANDS BEFORE US, REALIZING THAT
- 10 THIS WHOLE PROCESS IS ONE OF COMPROMISE AND WE
- 11 NEVER GO AWAY FROM ONE OF THESE GETTING EVERYTHING
- 12 WE WANT. BUT TWO ITEMS AND THIS CREEPING FEELING
- 13 THAT I'VE HAD OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS, LAST FEW
- 14 MONTHS OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT AND EVERY DAY, AND IT
- 15 WAS JUST REINFORCED HERE AGAIN, THAT THAT'S
- 16 SOMETHING THAT'S BEEN GOING ON FOR A LONG TIME.
- 17 WE KNOW A LOT ABOUT IT. THERE'S A LOT OF PROJECTS
- 18 OUT THERE. IF WE ARE SPENDING MONEY FOR TESTING
- 19 PURPOSES, THERE'S PLENTY OF PLACES TO TEST
- 20 ALREADY.
- 21 THE PROPOSAL OR THE TECHNICAL CENTER
- 22 IS WORTHWHILE BECAUSE I THINK THAT CAN SPREAD THE
- 23 CONCEPT TO LAY DOWN MORE MILES WITH LIMITED AMOUNT
- 24 OF RESOURCES THAT WE HAVE. JUST FOR THE PURPOSE
- OF DOING IT IS IN THE FEEL GOOD CATEGORY, AND I'M

WILLING TO FEEL GOOD ABOUT MATS FOR SCHOOLS AND

1

I'M WILLING TO FEEL GOOD ABOUT LAYING DOWN A 2 3 LITTLE BIT MORE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT AT THE EXPENSE 4 OF SOME OTHER WORTHWHILE PROJECT. IN FACT, I'M 5 EVEN WILLING TO GO SO FAR AS TO SUGGEST, IN ORDER б TO SAVE A LOT OF PAPERWORK AND COMPETITIVE BIDDING 7 AND ALL OF THAT AND STAFF WORK THAT WE WANT TO 8 AVOID, THAT WE SPEND ALL THE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT MONEY IN HUMBOLDT COUNTY AND ALL THE MATS IN NAPA 9 10 COUNTY WILL BE ONE PLACE WHERE EVERYBODY CAN GO 11 AND ENJOY A VACATION AND LOOK AT THEM, AND IT 12 WON'T INVOLVE A WHOLE LOT OF WORK. WE CAN JUST MAKE THE GRANTS TO THOSE ENTITIES. 13 14 KEEPING IN MIND, THOUGH, AS SOMEONE 15 ONCE TOLD ME, NEVER FORGET IN CALIFORNIA THAT HALF OF ALL THE PEOPLE LIVE SOUTH OF SUNSET BOULEVARD. 16 17 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. WELL, THEN, LET'S GO TO -- ANYBODY HAVE ANYTHING ELSE THEY 18 19 WISH TO SAY? 20 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: LET ME ASK A 21 QUESTION IF I MAY. DID YOU SAY THAT UNDER YOUR 22 MOTION, THE ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO UTILIZE AN AD HOC ADVISORY 23 24 COMMITTEE, DID YOU SAY TO DELETE THAT?

1	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: YOU DID.
2	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: YES.
3	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: MAY I ASK WHY?
4	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I THINK WE HAVE
5	ROOMS FULL OF ADVISORS, AD HOC COMMITTEES, AND WE
6	HAVE A COMMITTEE STRUCTURE OF OUR OWN. AND IF WE
7	NEED ANY ADVICE, I THINK WE HAVE PLENTY OF IT. I
8	THINK THESE THINGS, THEY TAKE ON A LIFE OF THEIR
9	OWN, AND I DON'T SEE THE VALUE IN IT. AND SO I'D
10	LIKE TO DO AWAY WITH THAT. IF WE WANT HELP, WE
11	CAN HAVE IT. ALL WE HAVE TO DO IS HAVE A
12	COMMITTEE HEARING OF OUR OWN OR WE CAN FOLLOW UP.
13	WE'RE NOT LACKING FOR INFORMATION OR I DON'T KNOW
14	THE PURPOSE OF IT. OKAY.
15	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU.
16	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. WE HAVE A
17	MOTION BEFORE US. I WILL YOU WANT ME TO GO
18	THROUGH IT AGAIN, DON'T YOU?
19	THE SECRETARY: IS IT THIS?
20	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: YES.
21	THE SECRETARY: PLUS THE OTHER CHANGES,
22	OR IS IT JUST
23	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: JUST THIS.
24 25	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: WHAT ABOUT THIS? CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THAT'S PART OF IT.

1 I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THIS EXCEPT THE 2 FUNDING LEVEL IS 200,000. 3 MR. CHANDLER: MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE HAD AN EXTENSIVE AMOUNT OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY. FOR 4 5 PURPOSES OF THOSE IN THE AUDIENCE, IT MIGHT BE 6 GOOD TO VERY BRIEFLY JUST RECAP YOUR PROPOSAL. 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: SURE. AND I WILL 8 MAKE ONE CONCESSION HERE TO MRS. GOTCH. HOW ABOUT 9 IF WE GO -- HOW ABOUT 40-60 ON YOUR MATS THERE? BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: I'M STILL ASKING FOR 10 11 THE 50-50. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I KNOW YOU ARE. 12 13 I'M HELPING YOU THERE A LITTLE BIT. OKAY. 14 I'M GOING TO MOVE THE ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION ON POLICY STATEMENT 15 16 AND OBJECTIVES REGARDING WASTE TIRES. THIS 17 LANGUAGE APPEARS ON PAGE 17 OF THE BOARD PACKET. 18 THE ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION TO UTILIZE AN AD HOC ADVISORY 19 20 COMMITTEE BE DELETED. 21 ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING FUNDING: 22 PILOT LEA PROGRAM GRANT PROGRAM, 200,000; HIGHWAY 23 PATROL INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT, A HUNDRED THOUSAND;

DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES INTERAGENCY, 15,000.

STATE CLEANUP CONTRACT, 750,000 IS THE MINIMUM

24

1 WITH UP TO A MILLION FIVE SO THAT WE CAN HAVE THE 2 FUNDS ALLOCATED. LOCAL GOVERNMENT CLEANUP MATCHING GRANTS, 250. THESE GRANTS WILL BE AT 3 50-50 MATCH. FIRE MARSHAL INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT, 4 A HUNDRED THOUSAND. STATEWIDE CENTER FOR 5 6 RUBBERIZED ASPHALT, 500,000. THE CENTER WILL BE 7 FOR TECHNICAL -- TRANSFER OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, 8 TRAINING, INFORMATION DISSEMINATION BETWEEN LOCAL 9 GOVERNMENTS. FINANCIAL SERVICES, \$50,000 IS AUTHORIZED TO BE ENCUMBERED NOW AND ANOTHER 25 UP 10 TO 50,000 AUGMENTATION, IF NECESSARY. COAL 11 COGENERATION TESTING, 200,000; CEMENT KILN 12 INFORMATION DISSEMINATION, 50. LOCAL GOVERNMENT 13 SCHOOL DISTRICTS PLAYGROUND MATS, 250. THESE ARE 14 TO BE ON A 60 LOCAL FUNDS, 40 BOARD FUNDS. 15 16 GRANTS ARE AVAILABLE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, 17 SUBDIVISIONS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING SCHOOL 18 DISTRICTS, FOR THE USE OF RECYCLED RUBBER IN PLAYGROUND RECONSTRUCTION. A PRUDENT RESERVE OF 19 20 \$500,000. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 21 EXPENDITURES OF THE FUND WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE 22 POLICY COMMITTEE AND TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL AS

NECESSARY. LOCAL GOVERNMENT RUBBERIZED ASPHALT

MATCHING GRANTS, 200,000. I GAVE THAT PIECE OF

23

2425

PAPER AWAY.

1 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: NOW WITH THE 50-50. 2 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: YES. 250, CIWMB 3 LOCAL GOVERNMENT INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT, RATIO 50-50 MATCHING FUNDS. 4 5 THE SECRETARY: WAIT A MINUTE. WAIT A 6 MINUTE. I'M LOST. 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THAT'S OFF THIS 8 PIECE OF PAPER. THIS IS ALL STILL PART OF THE 9 LOCAL GOVERNMENT RUBBERIZED ASPHALT MATCHING GRANTS, 200. ESTABLISH A MINIMUM CIWMB PROJECTS 10 OF 50,000 TO COORDINATE EDUCATION AND ASSISTANCE 11 12 WITH STATE CENTER FOR SPECIAL SERVICES. RMDZ LOANS FOR TIRE RECYCLING, 230,000. THIS IS A 13 TOTAL OF 3,395,000. AND THEN WE'RE GOING -- OKAY. 14 THAT'S THE MOTION. I THINK --15 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I SECONDED THAT. 16 17 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: I REALIZE THIS IS 18 CONSECUTIVE, BUT SOMETHING WAS ADDRESSED EARLIER THAT I WANTED TO CLEAR UP, AND THAT WAS, CAREN, 19 20 WHAT YOU HAD BROUGHT UP. AND I WANT TO MAKE IT 21 KNOWN THAT I'D BE HAPPY TO WORK WITH STAFF ON MOH 22 TO WORK OUT THE GRANTS WHEN WE DISCUSSED THAT 23 EARLIER AS FAR AS JURISDICTION CAP OR SOMETHING. 24 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. 25 THE SECRETARY: CAN I VERIFY ONE PART?

```
1
      LOCAL GOVERNMENT RUBBERIZED ASPHALT MATCHING
      GRANTS, 200,000.
 2
 3
               CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: 200,000.
 4
               THE SECREATRY: 50-50 MATCH.
 5
               CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: 50-50 MATCH.
 6
               THE SECRETARY: 50,000 MAX.
 7
               CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. CALL THE
 8
      ROLL.
 9
               BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.
10
               BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: NO.
11
               BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.
12
               BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.
13
               BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH.
14
               BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: NO.
15
               BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.
               BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
16
17
               BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.
18
               CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. MOTION FAILS.
               BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, I
19
20
      TOO, LIKE MR. FRAZEE, WANT TO -- I WANT TO
THANK
      MR. FRAZEE AND MR. PENNINGTON AND ALL OF YOU
21
FOR
22
      THE EFFORTS TO FIND SOME ACCOMMODATION HERE. I
```

THINK WE'RE PRETTY DARN CLOSE. I WOULD LIKE TO

- OFFER THE SAME MOTION WITH, I THINK, WITH VERY MINOR MODIFICATIONS.

1 I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THAT -- THE 2 SAME MOTION, BUT FOR THE PLAYGROUND MATS WITH A 3 50-50 MATCHING FUND RATIO AND WITH A PROVISION THAT ALLOWS AUGMENTATION OF THE FUNDS FOR THAT 4 5 PROJECT IF MONEY BECOMES AVAILABLE. AND OF 6 COURSE, I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT A SPECIFIC DOLLAR 7 AMOUNT. WE'D HAVE TO EXAMINE THAT AT THE TIME 8 THAT THEY WERE ALLOCATING ADDITIONAL FUNDS THAT 9 BECAME AVAILABLE AT A LATER DATE. 10 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: WHAT'S THE AMOUNT? 11 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: THE AMOUNT FOR THE PLAYGROUND MATS WOULD BE THE SAME AS MR. 12 13 PENNINGTON, WHICH IS 250, I BELIEVE. 14 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: CORRECT. 15 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: BUT THERE WOULD BE 16 A PROVISION THAT WE WOULD CONSIDER AUGMENTATION IF 17 FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE AT A LATER DATE. 18 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: WE'D CONSIDER IT. 19 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WELL, JUST LIKE 20 THE OTHERS. I'M ASSUMING WHEN WE SAY FINANCIAL 21 SERVICES 50 TO 75, THAT WE'RE NOT SAYING THAT 22 ISN'T GOING TO BE 75 RIGHT NOW. WE'RE GOING TO 23 EXAMINE THAT WHEN WE FIND OUT HOW MUCH ADDITIONAL 24 MONEY IS AVAILABLE. ANYWAY, THAT WOULD BE MY 25 MOTION. OTHERWISE IT'S IDENTICAL.

1

BOARD MEMBER RELIS: IN THAT MOTION, JUST

A CLARIFICATION, THAT 30-PERCENT CAP ISSUE, WAS 2 3 THAT DEALT WITH? THAT SHOULD BE IN THE MOTION. 4 ON THE END USE. REMEMBER, THE END USE CONTRACTS, 5 WE'D GIVE A 30 PERCENT. I THINK WE LEFT THAT OUT 6 INADVERTENTLY. 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: RIGHT. 8 COMMITTEE WE DID. 9 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: YES. 10 MS. RICE: FOR THE CLEANUP CONTRACT. 11 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: ALSO, WHAT I HAD 12 JUST MENTIONED WITH CAREN, AND THAT WOULD MAKE IT A \$25,000 CAP PER JURISDICTION FOR THE GRANTS TO 13 14 HELP WORK OUT WITH YOU IS SOMETHING I'M SUGGESTING 15 TO MAKE IT A LITTLE BIT EASIER FOR STAFF TO WORK 16 OUT THE GRANTS. 17 MS. TRGOVCICH: I WOULD APPRECIATE MAYBE IF WE CAN COME BACK AND WORK OUT WITH YOU ON A 18 19 PROPOSAL BECAUSE ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE WOULD 20 LIKE TO DO IS BE ABLE TO EMPHASIZE OUR EXISTING 21 PROGRAMS WITH SCHOOLS IN PROMOTING RECYCLING, AND 22 IT MAY BE THAT ON A JURISDICTION OR DISTRICT BASIS 23 THAT MAY NOT SERVE TO COORDINATE WELL WITH THE 2.4 SO I'D LIKE TO BE ABLE TO COME SCHOOLS PROGRAMS. 25 BACK WITH A PROPOSAL TO WORK WITH YOU ON.

1 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WELL, THE PROBLEM IS THAT IT'S -- GRANTS ARE AVAILABLE TO LOCAL 2 3 GOVERNMENTS AND SUBDIVISIONS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, 4 INCLUDING SCHOOL DISTRICTS, SO I MEAN A PARK 5 DISTRICT COULD BE IN THERE. IT'S NOT. I THINK б THAT WAS YOUR INTENTION TOO. 7 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: ON THAT POINT, I THINK THAT THE POINT THAT MR. CHESBRO MADE EARLIER 8 ON THE ASPHALT PAVING AND CERTAINLY PERTINENT TO 9 10 THIS ONE, I DON'T THINK WE WANT TO BE IN THE 11 POSITION OF PUTTING THESE RATHER SMALL AMOUNTS IN 12 THE SCHEME OF THINGS OUT FOR THE WORLD TO BID ON. BECAUSE YOU CAN END UP WITH JURISDICTIONS TOTALLY 13 14 SPENDING MORE MONEY BIDDING FOR THIS MONEY THAN 15 THEY'RE GOING TO GET. I WENT THROUGH THAT 16 EXPERIENCE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SPENDING MONEY 17 CHASING GRANTS WHEN WE COULD HAVE SPENT THE MONEY ON SOMETHING WORTHWHILE. I THINK BOTH FROM STAFF 18 RESOURCES STANDPOINT, WE NEED TO FIND A WAY OF 19 20 NARROWING THAT. YOU KNOW, I MAY HAVE BEEN 2.1 FACETIOUS ABOUT SPENDING IT ALL IN NAPA COUNTY. 22 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I HOPE YOU WERE. 23 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: BUT, YOU KNOW, 2.4 SOMETHING THAT NARROWS IT DOWN SO YOU DON'T HAVE

EVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT IN CALIFORNIA WASTING THEIR

TIME DEVELOPING GRANTS.

1

2 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WE'LL MAKE SURE 3 THERE'S SOME SCHOOLS IN NORTHERN SAN DIEGO COUNTY. 4 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: RIGHT. I AGREE. 5 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. ARE WE CLEAR 6 NOW? 7 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND. 8 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. IT'S BEEN 9 MOVED AND SECONDED. WE THINK WE KNOW WHAT WE'RE 10 DOING. 11 BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO. 12 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE. 13 BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE. 14 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE. 15 BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH. 16 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE. 17 BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS. 18 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE. 19 BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON. 20 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. 21 MS. TRGOVCICH: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON, NEED 22 TO ADD ONE MORE THING INTO THE MIX, BUT COULD WE 23 GET CLARIFICATION AROUND THE STATEWIDE CENTER, HOW 24 YOU WOULD LIKE US TO PROCEED? 25 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WE'D LIKE TO DIRECT

- 1 THE STAFF TO WORK WITH THE ADVISORS ON DEVELOPING
- 2 THE PROPER EITHER INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT OR AN RFP.
- 3 I THINK THEY SHOULD LOOK AT AND SEE WHICHEVER, BUT
- 4 I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE BY VOICE VOTE.
- 5 MR. CHANDLER: SO AM I UNDERSTANDING THIS
- 6 TO BE THAT WE'LL LET THE ADVISORS AND STAFF DECIDE
- 7 WHICH SOLICITATION PROCESS, THAT THIS BOARD IS
- 8 DIRECTING --
- 9 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: BRING SOMETHING
- 10 BACK TO US.
- 11 MR. CHANDLER: BRING SOMETHING BACK. ALL
- 12 RIGHT. WE'LL BRING YOU BACK BOTH OPTIONS.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I'M COMFORTABLE WITH
- AN INTERAGENCY MYSELF.
- 15 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I'LL MOVE THAT THE
- 16 STAFF DEVELOP AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT BETWEEN
- 17 L.A. COUNTY AND THE WASTE BOARD TO DEVELOP A --
- 18 BETWEEN THE WASTE BOARD AND L.A. COUNTY TO DEVELOP
- 19 A STATEWIDE CENTER FOR RUBBERIZED ASPHALT. THAT'S
- 20 MY MOTION.
- BOARD MEMBER RELIS: SECOND.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, THE
- OTHER QUESTION THAT GOT RAISED BESIDES THE
- 24 QUESTION OF HOW WE WERE GOING TO LET IT OUT WAS
- 25 MAKING SURE THAT WE HAD A CLEAR SCOPE. AND SO

1 THINK THAT THE PROCESS THAT WAS SUGGESTED ABOUT 2 ADVISOR AND STAFF INTERACTION, THAT IT WOULD BE 3 VERY APPROPRIATE FOR US TO TAKE A LOT OF THE COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE HERE TODAY AND TRY TO COME 4 5 UP WITH A CLEAR ENOUGH SET OF GOALS THAT WE CAN 6 REALLY HAVE A MEASURABLE RESULT AS A RESULT OF 7 THAT SCOPE. I WOULD JUST ADD THAT AS A GENERAL 8 SUGGESTION. 9 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ARE WE SUFFICIENTLY 10 CLEAR? 11 MS. TRGOVCICH: SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MR. RELIS SECONDED. 12 13 ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL. 14 BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO. BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE. 15 16 BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE. 17 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: NO. 18 BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH. 19 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE. 20 BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS. 21 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE. 22 BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON. 23 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. 24 OKAY. ITEM 36, CONSIDERATION OF 25 ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION --

1 MS. TRGOVCICH, WE HAVE SOME 2 ADDITIONAL STAFF REQUESTS THAT WE'D LIKE TO MAKE. 3 STAFF WILL REPORT BACK TO THE COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD IN THE SPRING OF '97 WITH AN ANALYSIS OF 4 5 UNENCUMBERED FUNDS FROM '96-'97 AND 6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALLOCATION. AND STAFF WILL 7 REPORT BACK AT THE JANUARY '97 POLICY COMMITTEE 8 MEETING ON THE STATUS OF '95-'96 CIVIL ENGINEERING 9 CONTRACT. 10 OKAY. MOVING ON TO ITEM 36, 11 CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE 12 DECLARATION AND FINANCIAL ASSURANCE AND 13 ENFORCEMENT REGULATIONS FOR SOLID WASTE LANDFILL 14 FINANCIAL ASSURANCE VIOLATIONS. MS. RICE. MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND 15 MEMBERS. THIS ITEM HOPEFULLY WILL BE MUCH BRIEFER 16 17 THAN THE LAST ITEM. THESE WERE REGULATIONS 18 PRESENTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE A FEW WEEKS AGO. THERE WERE SOME LATE COMMENTS RECEIVED 19 20 THAT WERE DISCUSSED AT THAT TIME. AND DIANA 21 VAUGHN-THOMAS WILL PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION ON THE 22 REGULATIONS AND THE COMMENTS RECEIVED FOR YOUR 23 CONSIDERATION. 24 SIMILAR TO OTHER REGULATIONS THAT 25 YOU'VE HEARD TODAY, THIS ITEM WOULD REQUIRE TWO

1 MOTIONS SHOULD YOU BE IN THE MODE OF ADOPTING IT 2 TODAY, ONE ON THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND ONE ON 3 THE REGULATIONS. 4 MS. VAUGHN-THOMAS: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS 5 6 OUT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW DURING THE PERIOD OF 7 SEPTEMBER 20TH THROUGH OCTOBER 23D. THE NEGATIVE 8 DECLARATION FOR THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS FOUND 9 THAT THESE REGULATIONS WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT. 10 11 THE PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD FOR THE 12 PROPOSED REGULATIONS WAS FROM SEPTEMBER 20TH 13 THROUGH NOVEMBER 4TH. THESE REGULATIONS ARE BASED ON THE FINANCIAL ASSURANCE ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES 14 15 WHICH WERE DISSEMINATED TO INTERESTED PARTIES 16 EARLIER THIS YEAR. 17 WE RECEIVED COMMENTS ON THOSE 18 PROCEDURES FROM INTERESTED PARTIES AND SUBSEQUENTLY INCORPORATED THEM INTO THE PROPOSED 19 20 REGULATIONS. AS A RESULT OF SOME OF THE COMMENTS 21 THAT WE RECEIVED ON THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS, WE 22 MADE MINOR MODIFICATIONS, WHICH DO NOT REQUIRE 23 RENOTICING OF THE REGULATIONS. 24 WE RECEIVED NINE COMMENT LETTERS.

MANY OF THE COMMENTS WERE OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF

1 THIS PROPOSED REGULATORY PACKAGE. SOME COMMENTS 2 WERE IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS. AND 3 SPECIFICALLY, WE RECEIVED COMMENTS FROM WASTE MANAGEMENT ON AN ISSUE THAT WE ARE BRINGING 4 FORWARD TO YOU TODAY FOR CONSIDERATION. 5 6 THE REGULATIONS PROVIDE FOR 7 ASSESSING PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE 8 FINANCIAL ASSURANCE ENFORCEMENT REGULATIONS. AS A 9 PART OF THAT PROCESS, THERE ARE FACTORS THAT MAY BE INCLUDED AS PART OF DETERMINING AN INITIAL 10 PENALTY. ONE OF THE FACTORS IS THE ABILITY TO PAY 11 ISSUE, WHICH MEANS WHETHER OR NOT AN OPERATOR HAS 12 13 THE ABILITY TO PAY A PARTICULAR PENALTY. 14 THIS FACTOR WAS THE SUBJECT OF WASTE MANAGEMENT'S COMMENT. WASTE MANAGEMENT SUPPORTS 15 THE BOARD'S RELIANCE ON THE FACTORS TO MODIFY 16 17 PENALTY AMOUNTS WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE ABILITY 18 TO PAY ISSUE. WASTE MANAGEMENT BELIEVES THAT 19 PENALTIES FOR FINANCIAL ASSURANCE VIOLATIONS 20 SHOULD NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR RELIEF BASED ON THE 21 INABILITY TO PAY. 22 WASTE MANAGEMENT FURTHER COMMENTED 23 THAT IT WAS NOT FAIR TO THOSE FISCALLY SOUND 24 FACILITY OPERATORS SUBJECT TO HIGHER PENALTY 25 COMPARED TO A FISCALLY MARGINAL OPERATOR WITH THE

1 SAME VIOLATIONS. 2 ANOTHER ISSUE THAT WASTE MANAGEMENT 3 BROUGHT UP WAS REGARDING THE REQUEST -- WAS REGARDING THE FACT THAT AN OPERATOR WHO HAS -- WHO 4 HAPPENS TO BE IN THE POSITION OF NOT BEING ABLE TO 5 6 PAY A PARTICULAR PENALTY ALSO MAY BE IN THE 7 POSITION OF BEING CLOSE TO BANKRUPTCY. THEREFORE, 8 WASTE MANAGEMENT IS REQUESTING THAT WE REMOVE THAT 9 PARTICULAR FACTOR FROM THE REGULATIONS. AT THE P&E COMMITTEE MEETING, THERE 10 WERE DISCUSSIONS AROUND PRECEDENTS SET FOR THIS 11 PARTICULAR FACTOR BEING CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE 12 13 PENALTY DETERMINATION. STAFF IS AWARE OF A COUPLE OF SITUATIONS WHERE PRECEDENT HAS BEEN SET. THE 14 WATER BOARD OR THE WATER CODE -- EXCUSE ME --15 16 SECTION 13327 SPECIFICALLY STATES THAT THE ABILITY 17 TO PAY MAY BE USED AS A DETERMINING FACTOR FOR 18 ASSESSING A PENALTY. COMMON PRACTICES BY THE DEPARTMENT 19 20 OF TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTROL, AS WELL AS JUDGES IN 21 CERTAIN COURT PROCEEDINGS, MAY ALSO CONSIDER THIS 22 PARTICULAR FACTOR. THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE ALSO 23 ALLOWS THE BOARD TO CONSIDER CIRCUMSTANCES AND 24 CONDITIONS THAT AFFECT AN OPERATOR'S ABILITY TO 25 COMPLY WITH THE REGULATIONS.

SO THE ISSUE HERE BEFORE THE BOARD

1

AT THIS TIME IS WHETHER OR NOT TO MAINTAIN THAT 2 3 PARTICULAR FACTOR, WHETHER TO REMOVE IT AS REQUESTED BY WASTE MANAGEMENT, OR POSSIBLY MODIFY 4 5 IT, TO POSSIBLY DEFINE IT AS A FACTOR THAT MAY BE 6 USED TO PERHAPS LENGTHEN THE TIME OF A PENALTY 7 BEING PAID RATHER THAN DECREASING A PENALTY. 8 THIS ITEM IS BEING PRESENTED TO YOU WITHOUT A STAFF RECOMMENDATION. IF THE BOARD 9 10 CHOOSES TO REMOVE THIS PARTICULAR PROVISION, IT 11 WILL REQUIRE STAFF TO SEND THE NOTICE OUT AGAIN 12 FOR A 15-DAY NOTICE. I'LL BE GLAD TO ANSWER ANY 13 QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE. 14 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: QUESTIONS? OKAY. 15 MR. CHUCK WHITE. 16 MR. WHITE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. 17 CHUCK WHITE WITH WASTE MANAGEMENT WMX. I WILL BE 18 BRIEF. ONE THING I DID WANT TO BRING UP IS THAT 19 THERE WAS ACTUALLY TWO ISSUES THAT WE WROTE THE 20 LETTER ON. 21 THE FIRST ISSUE WAS THE LENGTH OF 22 TIME FOR A VIOLATOR TO RESPOND TO A NOTICE THAT 23 YOU'RE IN VIOLATION OF THESE REGULATIONS. AND AT 2.4 THE COMMITTEE MEETING, WE TALKED ABOUT THAT A 25 RESPONSE COULD BE JUST SIMPLY A LETTER SAYING WE

1 GOT YOUR CONCERN OR COMPLAINT, AND WE'RE 2 PROCESSING IT. 3 AND THE CONCERN WAS IS TEN DAYS 4 REALLY APPROPRIATE TIME TO PUT TOGETHER A COMPLETE 5 EVALUATION AND RESPONSE. AND I GOT THE IMPRESSION б THAT THAT WAS OKAY AS LONG AS SOME RESPONSE WAS 7 RECEIVED WITHIN TEN DAYS. DOESN'T HAVE TO BE THE 8 COMPLETE RESPONSE TO THE ALLEGATIONS. AND I DON'T THINK THERE'S A NEED TO CHANGE THE REGULATIONS. 9 10 BUT IF IT IS THE BOARD'S DESIRE TO MAYBE CLARIFY 11 THAT IN YOUR FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS, I THINK 12 THAT WOULD BE MORE THAN APPROPRIATE, THAT YOU'RE JUST BASICALLY LOOKING FOR A RESPONSE, THAT YOU'RE 13 14 ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT OF IT, THAT YOU'RE TAKING 15 ACTION TO PROVIDE A MORE FULL RESPONSE. 16 TEN DAYS IS KIND OF A SHORT TIME, 17 PARTICULARLY DEALING WITH COMPLEX FINANCIAL 18 ARRANGEMENTS. IF THAT'S THE UNDERSTANDING, THAT A RESPONSE IS ALL WE'RE TALKING ABOUT, THAT'S FINE. 19 20 IF WE'RE TALKING ABOUT THE FINAL RESPONSE, AT 21 WHICH TIME YOU GET DOWN TO, YOU KNOW, 22 NEGOTIATIONS, I THINK THAT'S PROBABLY A VERY SHORT 23 TIME TO PUT POTENTIALLY A COMPLEX THING TOGETHER.

I'D BE INTERESTED IN YOUR THOUGHTS ON THAT ONE.

WITH RESPECT TO MS. THOMAS'

24

1 DESCRIPTION, IT REALLY IS OUR CONCERN. THERE MAY BE AREAS IN THE WATER CODE THAT DO THIS, BUT I'M 2 3 NOT AWARE OF ANY OTHER REGULATION IN STATE 4 GOVERNMENT THAT GIVES ABILITY TO PAY AS A 5 MODIFYING FACTOR IN THE AMOUNT YOU CAN PAY. б THE WAY THE REGULATIONS ARE WRITTEN, IT SAYS THE 7 FOLLOWING FACTORS MAY BE USED TO CONSIDER THE AMOUNT YOU ARE GOING TO PAY, NOT NECESSARILY THE 8 LENGTH OF TIME YOU'RE GOING TO TAKE TO PAY. I 9 10 GUESS OUR PREFERENCE WOULD BE TO TAKE IT OUT 11 ENTIRELY FROM THE REGULATIONS. IS IT REALLY 12 APPROPRIATE? REMEMBER WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT. 13 14 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT FINANCIAL ASSURANCE. 15 SOMEBODY HASN'T PROVIDED FINANCIAL ASSURANCE BECAUSE THEY'VE GOT AN INABILITY TO PROVIDE 16 FINANCIAL ASSURANCE, SO THEY GET PENALIZED. 17 18 AND THEY'VE GOT AN INABILITY TO PAY THE PENALTY. SO, THEREFORE, THERE'S NO FINANCIAL ASSURANCE AND 19 20 THERE'S NO PENALTY. 21 I MEAN IT JUST STRIKES AS KIND OF 22 ABSURD AND STRANGE THAT THAT WOULD EVEN BE A 23 FACTOR, PARTICULARLY FOR THESE KINDS OF FINANCIAL 24 ASSURANCE REGULATIONS.

SO OUR FIRST PREFERENCE WOULD BE FOR

1 YOU TO STRIKE IT FROM THE REGULATIONS. GO FOR THE 15-DAY RENOTICE. IF YOU FEEL YOU NEED TO PUT 2 3 SOMETHING LIKE THIS IN AND YOU LIMIT IT SOLELY TO 4 THE TIME OF THE PAYBACK OF THE PENALTY EXTENDED 5 OVER A PERIOD OF TIME WITHOUT MODIFYING THE б FACTOR, I THINK THAT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE. 7 CERTAINLY NOT OUR PREFERABLY WAY OF DEALING WITH 8 THIS ISSUE WHICH WE BELIEVE REALLY IS UNIQUE IN REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT REGULATIONS IN THE 9 10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA. 11 SO AGAIN, THE TWO ISSUES, ONE IS 12 JUST GIVE CLARIFICATION ON WHAT IS -- IN THE FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS WHAT IS AN ADEQUATE RESPONSE? 13 14 AND WE THOUGHT WE HEARD AT THE P&E MEETING THAT A 15 RESPONSE IS JUST A RESPONSE, NOTHING BEYOND THAT. AND THE SECOND ISSUE IS WHERE SHOULD -- WHAT YOU 16 17 SHOULD DO WITH THIS ISSUE OF ABILITY TO PAY PARTICULARLY FOR THESE FINANCIAL ASSURANCE 18 19 REGULATIONS. THANK YOU. 20 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU. 21 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: QUESTION FOR THE 22 STAFF. MAYBE I HEARD IN MY BRIEFING WRONG, SO I'M 23 NOT GOING TO CHARACTERIZE IT. LET ME ASK THE

QUESTION AGAIN. I THOUGHT I HEARD THAT THERE ARE, IN FACT, OTHER EXAMPLES OF COMPARABLE REGULATIONS

24

1 ELSEWHERE IN STATE GOVERNMENT THAT DO PROVIDE FOR 2 THIS KIND OF FLEXIBILITY. 3 MS. VAUGHN-THOMAS: NO, THERE ARE NO 4 REGULATIONS. THERE IS THE WATER CODE AGAIN THAT SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIES THAT AS A FACTOR, BUT 5 6 THERE ARE NO STATE REGULATIONS. 7 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: SO IT'S STATUTORY. 8 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AS HARSH AS IT 9 SOUNDS, YOU HAVE TO, I THINK, WITH GOOD REGULATION HOLD ALL PARTIES TO THE SAME STANDARD OTHERWISE. 10 AND I WOULD THINK THIS WOULD BE INCONSISTENT WITH 11 RCRA. THE WHOLE DIRECTION OF RCRA WAS TO -- I 12 13 MEAN IF WE WERE TO HAVE A FLEXIBLE SYSTEM BECAUSE THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF RCRA WAS BOTH TO CLOSE DOWN 14 15 THE SMALL FACILITIES THAT COULDN'T OPERATE UNDER A RCRA SUBTITLE D ENVIRONMENT. SO I'LL JUST THROW 16 17 THAT IN. 18 MS. RICE: JUST TO POINT OUT, NOT AS A POINT OF DISAGREEMENT, BUT JUST CLARITY, THE WHOLE 19 20 PROPOSAL IS ONE OF SOME AMOUNT OF FLEXIBILITY. 21 ALL OF THE FACTORS LISTED UNDER THE SUB B ON PAGE 22 258, I BELIEVE, OF YOUR ITEM ARE FACTORS WHICH CAN 23 BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION, MAYBE CONSIDERED IN

MODIFYING THE AMOUNT OF THE PENALTY, AND SO THOSE

ARE ALL SOMEWHAT SUBJECTIVE. THIS IS NOT A

24

1 REGULATORY PACKAGE THAT WOULD LEAD TO ONE DEFINED 2 AMOUNT OF PENALTY FOR EACH VIOLATION. 3 THEY'RE FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED, SO STAFF HAD MERELY BEEN PROPOSING THE ABILITY TO PAY 4 AS ONE OF THOSE FACTORS, AND WE'RE GOING TO TAKE 5 6 WHATEVER DIRECTION THE BOARD MAY PROVIDE ON THAT 7 FACTOR; BUT EVEN IF THAT ONE FACTOR IS REMOVED, 8 THERE ARE OTHER FACTORS IN HERE WHICH WOULD BE 9 LOOKED AT ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS. 10 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: ON THAT POINT, MR. CHAIR, I WOULD PROPOSE THAT WE EXTRACT THE 11 LANGUAGE ON ABILITY TO PAY, BEARING IN MIND THAT 12 13 ALL THESE OTHER FACTORS ARE STILL AT PLAY AND WOULD BEAR ON DECISIONS BY THIS BOARD. 14 15 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IS THAT A MOTION? 16 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: YES. 17 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WE HAVE A SECOND? BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I'LL SECOND. 18 19 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN, I 20 DISAGREE WITH THE MOTION. FIRST OF ALL, I THINK WE REALIZE, JUST LIKE THE \$10,000 A DAY FINES AT 21 22 THE END OF THE 939 PROCESS OR EVEN SOONER, THAT IN23 SOME CASES IT'S GOING TO BE TRYING TO EXTRACT 24 BLOOD FROM A TURNIP. THERE'S JUST THE REALITY OF

WHETHER THE RESOURCES ARE THERE OR NOT.

1 SECONDLY, I THINK, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, STAFF, BUT THE 2 3 STATUTORY AUTHORITY EXISTS WHETHER WE PUT IT IN THE REGULATIONS OR NOT. AND SO THIS IS JUST SOME 4 CLARIFICATION, AND I THINK THE BOARD IS GOING TO 5 6 HAVE TO FACE THE REALITY OF A LOCAL JURISDICTION'S 7 FINANCIAL ABILITY AT THE TIME THAT WE'RE UP 8 AGAINST IT REGARDLESS OF WHAT EXACTLY THESE REGS 9 SAY. SO I THINK REGULATIONS OUGHT TO REFLECT REALITY, AND REALITY IS THAT SOMEBODY IS GOING TO 10 COME IN AND PLEAD THAT CASE TO US UNDER STATUTE. 11 12 I THINK CHUCK RAISES, YOU KNOW, MR. WHITE RAISES GOOD POINTS, AND I CERTAINLY THINK 13 THAT WE OUGHT TO TAKE THOSE THINGS INTO ACCOUNT AT 14 THE TIME THAT WE'RE CONSIDERING PENALTIES AS WELL. 15 16 BUT I THINK WE HAVE TO FACE THE REALITY OF NEARLY 17 BANKRUPT LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHEN WE'RE MAKING 18 DECISIONS ABOUT PENALTIES. BOARD MEMBER RELIS: MY ONLY POINT IS WE 19 20 WILL HAVE TO FACE THAT REGARDLESS AND THE CRITERIA 21 ARE SUCH, BUT IF YOU PUT THE NUMBER -- IF YOU 22 ACTUALLY STATE, WELL, ONE OF OUR CRITERIA IS 23 WHETHER YOU HAVE ABILITY TO PAY TO OPERATE A 24 LANDFILL PROPERLY. I THINK THAT'S A GOOD IDEA.

BUT -- OKAY. THAT'S ALL.

MS. TOBIAS: MR. CHAIR, MAY I COMMENT,

1

2 PLEASE. I'M A LITTLE BIT UNCOMFORTABLE WITH THE 3 PROVISION OF HAVING INABILITY TO PAY IN THERE. I FEEL THAT IF THE WATER CODE DOES ACTUALLY HAVE 4 SPECIFIC AUTHORITY, WHICH I UNDERSTAND IT DOES, 5 TO 6 PUT THIS IN, THAT I FEEL THAT WE SHOULD HAVE 7 SPECIFIC AUTHORITY TO PUT IT IN AS WELL. THE FACT WE THAT DON'T I THINK ACTUALLY OPERATES AGAINST 8 9 HAVING THIS. 10 I ALSO SHARE MR. RELIS' CONCERNS 11 THAT WE HAVE AN EQUITABLE SYSTEM. ONE OF THE WAYS THAT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO DEAL WITH THIS WITHOUT 12 DEALING WITH IT IN THE REGS IS THAT WE ARE 13 14 ASSUMING UNDER THESE FINANCIAL ASSURANCE REGS THAT WE COULD STILL WORK OUT A STIPULATED AGREEMENT 15 16 WITH ANY ENTITY, WHICH WE HAVE JUST DONE, IN TERMS 17 OF WORKING OUT A PAYMENT SCHEDULE. AND I THINK 18 THAT THAT'S A WAY TO DO IT, PLUS THAT GIVES A CARROT FOR SOMEBODY TO ACTUALLY SIT DOWN AND WORK 19 20 IT OUT WITH US RATHER THAN US HAVING TO GO AFTER

21	THEM UNDER THESE REGS TRYING TO ASSERT A PENALTY.
22	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: SO WE COULD GO AT
IT	
23	THROUGH A STIPULATED AGREEMENT. WE HAVE A LOT OF
24 25	EXPERIENCE WITH THAT. MS. TOBIAS: THROUGH A STIPULATED

1 AGREEMENT AND IN ACTUALITY THAT MIGHT BE A CARROT 2 TO SOME OF THE JURISDICTIONS TO COME IN AND WORK 3 IT OUT THAT WAY. BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: SINCE WE'VE BEEN 4 LIKE SO AGREEABLE TODAY, WHAT DO YOU THINK, PAUL? 5 6 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I THINK THAT SOUNDS 7 LIKE A GOOD THING TO DO. STRIKE THE LANGUAGE AND 8 REFER TO THE STIPULATED. DO WE HAVE TO? OR IS 9 THAT ASSUMED? 10 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: SO THE SCHEDULE QUESTION IS ASSUMED? IT DOESN'T NEED TO BE IN 11 12 THERE? 13 MS. RICE: THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE SUGGESTION, THAT THE LANGUAGE BE STRIKED AND IT 14 15 SIMPLY BE AN ISSUE WHEN WE NEGOTIATE AN AGREEMENT 16 ON A VIOLATION. 17 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. IT'S BEEN 18 MOVED AND SECONDED. MOTION IS TO STRIKE THE LANGUAGE. AND WE HAVE TO ADOPT. 19 20 MS. RICE: I ASSUME THE DIRECTION, THEN, 21 WOULD BE WE WOULD NOTICE THESE FOR 15-DAY PUBLIC 22 COMMENT PERIOD AND COME BACK TO COMMITTEE AND

BOARD WHEN THE COMMENT PERIOD HAS RUN ITS COURSE.

CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: CORRECT. OKAY.

BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: WE CAN'T DO THE

23

24

1 NEGATIVE DEC TODAY EITHER? 2 MS. VAUGHN-THOMAS: I GUESS THAT DEPENDS 3 ON WHETHER OR NOT IT CHANGES THE --MS. TOBIAS: I THINK IT'D BE BETTER TO 4 5 WAIT. 6 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: OKAY. 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. IT'S BEEN 8 MOVED AND SECONDED. SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL. 9 BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO. BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I'M GOING TO PASS 10 11 FOR THE MOMENT BECAUSE I'M TRYING TO DECIDE WHETHER I THINK IT OUGHT BE SPECIFIED IN THE REG 12 13 OR NOT. 14 BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE. BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE. 15 16 BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH. 17 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE. 18 BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS. 19 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE. 20 BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON. 21 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. 22 DO YOU WANT TO VOTE OR NOT? 23 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I'LL VOTE AYE. 24 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. MOTION 25 CARRIES.

1 AND ITEM 37, CONSIDERATION OF SITE 2 REMEDIATION UNDER THE WASTE TIRE STABILIZATION AND 3 ABATEMENT PROGRAM. 4 MS. RICE: THANK YOU. 5 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. 6 CONSIDERATION OF SITE REMEDIATION UNDER THE WASTE 7 TIRE STABILIZATION AND ABATEMENT PROGRAM. 8 MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND 9 MEMBERS. WE HAVE TWO SITES, TIRE SITES, THAT WE'RE BRINGING FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION TODAY WHERE 10 WE ARE PROPOSING TO USE FUNDS, REMAINING FUNDS 11 12 FROM THE '94-'95 FISCAL YEAR CLEANUP CONTRACT, AND 13 GALE REHBERG WILL PRESENT INFORMATION ON WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING TO DO. 14 MS. REHBERG: WELL, IT'S NOT MORNING 15 16 ANYMORE. IT'S NOW AFTERNOON, BUT TO REMIND YOU 17 THE PRC SECTION 42826 AUTHORIZES THE BOARD TO 18 SPEND MONEY FROM THE CALIFORNIA TIRE RECYCLING 19 MANAGEMENT FUND TO PERFORM CLEANUP, ABATEMENT, 20 REMEDIAL WORK REQUIRED TO PREVENT POLLUTION, NUISANCE, OR INJURY TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH OR 21 SAFETY 22 AT WASTE TIRE SITES WHERE THE RESPONSIBLE PARTIES HAVE FAILED TO TAKE THE APPROPRIATE ACTION AS 23 24 RECOMMENDED BY THE BOARD.

IN RECOMMENDING THESE TWO SITES

THAT

- 1 I'M BRINGING FORWARD, STAFF INVESTIGATED AND
- 2 DETERMINED THAT EACH SITE REQUIRES ABATEMENT, AND
- 3 ABATEMENT IS NEEDED TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC HEALTH
- 4 AND SAFETY AND ALSO THE ENVIRONMENT.
- 5 WE'VE ALREADY TALKED ABOUT THE TWO
- 6 SITES IN OUR BRIEFINGS. SUNSET WASTE TIRE SITE
- 7 HAS APPROXIMATELY 250,000 WASTE TIRES WHICH HAVE
- 8 BEEN STOCKPILED IN A LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
- 9 NEIGHBORHOOD. SITUATION IS A PROPERTY OWNER
- 10 LEASED THE LAND OUT AND A TENANT STOCKPILED THE
- 11 TIRES ILLEGALLY.
- 12 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: HEARD THAT ONE
- 13 BEFORE.
- 14 MS. REHBERG: I WISH THERE WAS A NEW
- 15 LINE.
- 16 PETE NAVARRO WASTE TIRE SITE IS IN
- 17 FRESNO COUNTY. THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 30,000
- 18 WASTE TIRES ON SITE AT THIS TIME. ABOUT THREE
- 19 YEARS AGO 7,000 TIRES DID BURN, SO I DO HAVE SOME
- 20 BURN ASH ON SITE ALSO.
- 21 OUR REMEDIATION WILL REMOVE THE
- 22 30,000 WASTE TIRES, AND THE COUNTY WILL BE ASKED
- 23 TO DEAL WITH THE BURN ASH ON SITE AND THE STEEL
- 24 THAT'S REMAINING.
- 25 THE CURRENT PROPERTY OWNERS

- 1 PURCHASED THE PROPERTY WITH THE TIRES ON IT, AND 2 THEY ARE NOT THE RESPONSIBLE PARTIES, BUT YET THEY 3 KNEW THAT THE TIRES WOULD BE NEED TO BE 4 REMEDIATED. 5 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY QUESTIONS OF 6 STAFF? 7 MS. REHBERG: THE REASON WHY THIS DIDN'T 8 GET ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR IS BECAUSE OUR CEQA 9 PROCESS HAD NOT BEEN COMPLETED AT THE TIME THE COMMITTEE MET. I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT THAT 10 THESE TWO PROJECTS WILL BE VERY SHORT-TERM 11 12 DURATION, WILL HAVE BASICALLY NO IMPACT ON 13 TRAFFIC, AND PRECLUDE ANY RESPONSIBLE POSSIBILITY 14 OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS THROUGH THE REQUIRED 15 REMEDIATION. 16 STAFF IS RECOMMENDING EXEMPTION OF 17 THIS PROJECT FROM THE CEQA COMPLIANCE UNDER THE 18 CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION DESCRIBED IN CEOA GUIDELINES 19 CCR 15308. 20 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I MOVE
- BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SECOND.

21

SITES.

23 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY FURTHER

CONCURRENCE WITH THE REMEDIATION OF THE TWO

- QUESTIONS? IT'S BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED. WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL.

1	BOARD SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.
2	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.
3	BOARD SECRETARY: FRAZEE.
4	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.
5	BOARD SECRETARY: GOTCH.
6	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.
7	BOARD SECRETARY: RELIS.
8	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
9	BOARD SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.
10	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. MOTION
11	CARRIES.
12	ANY OPEN DISCUSSION? ANYBODY OUT
13	HERE THAT WANTS TO DISCUSS ANYTHING? THANK YOU
14	VERY MUCH. OKAY. COMMITTEE THE BOARD WILL
15	RECESS INTO AN EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS SOME
LEGAL	MATTERS AND PENDING SUITS. WE WILL ADJOURN
AFTER	THAT.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS AT 4 P.M. TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION. AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE CLOSED SESSION, THE BOARD MEETING WAS ADJOURNED.)

ise note:	These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.